DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 332 SP 031 068

TITLE	Using a Problem Solving Model To Revise the Teacher Education Program.
INSTITUTION	Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, TN. Peabody Coll.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Sep 88
NOTE	116p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Needs Assessment; Participative Decision Making; Preservice Teacher Education; *Problem Solving; *Program Evaluation; *Research Utilization; *Student Teaching; Teacher Behavior
IDENTIFIERS	Reflective Teaching; Vanderbilt University TN

ABSTRACT

The Department of Teaching and Learning of Peabody College of Vanderbilt University developed a project to strengthen field experiences for elementary/early childhood teacher education students. The project was designed to use current research to revise the laboratory and practica programs, incorporating technology and simulated classroom experiences. The ultimate goal was to develop teachers who would be problem solvers--able to assess each unique classroom situation and select from alternatives the strategy that would be the "best fit." The study addressed the problems that preservice teachers have in practicum situations and in student teaching. It also focused on the impact of the learning experiences of the project on the problem areas of the elementary/early childhood preservice teachers. The instructional processes used in the practica and student teaching programs were examined to determine which processes improved the problem solving and reflective processes of the preservice teachers. The study also explored how well the objectives and practica experiences reflect research and the effectiveness of using technology in the preparation of teachers. Under consideration also was the effectiveness of an advisory committee and field support team in redesigning a teacher education program. A program assessment report and a practice profile are included in this document. (Study sections are presented as "Project Portrayal," "Program Assessment Report," and "Practice Profile.") (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED348332

PROJECT PORTRAYAL

Using a Problem Solving Model to Revise the Teacher Education Program

Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

September, 1988

Project Director — Dorothy J. Skeel
Associate Director — Ann Neely
Technical Consultant — Robert Sherwood

Funded by a grant from the Office of
Educational Research and Improvement

SP031068

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT PORTRAYAL

Using a Problem Solving Model to Revise the Teacher Education Program

Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

September, 1988

Project Director — Dorothy J. Skeel
Associate Director — Ann Neely
Technical Consultant — Robert Sherwood

Funded by a grant from the Office of
Educational Research and Improvement

I. PROJECT PORTRAYAL

Using a Problem Solving Model To Revise the Teacher Education Program.

Just as the expectation for students of Vanderbilt's undergraduate teacher education program is to develop as "problem solvers" in the classroom, the faculty approached its tasks for program improvement utilizing a problem solving model. Using Polya's (1957) four phases of problem solving: understanding, planning, carrying out the plan, and looking back, the faculty made changes in the teacher preparation program.

Understanding Phase

This phase of Polya's model encompasses both problem recognition and problem representation. Lester (1985) suggests that expert problem solvers spend considerably more time than novices in analyzing and developing meaningful representations of problems before acting. The faculty spent considerable time identifying and defining the problem areas of the current undergraduate education program.

Numerous sources were used in determining the problem area or areas for growth to be addressed for possible change. During fall semester 1985, the elementary and early childhood student teachers' assessment data were compiled. Eight informal evaluations per student were conducted (total of 80 observations) during the initial student teaching placement. These narrative evaluations were reviewed and common problems were noted. General findings indicated problems with lesson transitions, lesson flow, awareness of the total class, and adjusting lessons when needed.

Formal evaluations made by the University supervisors and cooperating teachers were used to determine additional growth areas. These evaluations indicated that overall improvement was needed in questioning, making modification in instruction, and making and stating rules.

Through videotapes and performance in field experiences, practica students from fall semester 1985 provided further data. Analysis of these sources indicated general areas of growth needed in seatwork assignment, behavior toward high and low achieving students, reacting to student responses, uses of punishment, student responsibilities, and flow of lessons. In reviewing the research on beginning teachers (Veenman, 1984), many of the perceived problems were similar to those noted in our investigation.

An Advisory Committee composed of researchers and practitioners and a Field Support Team composed of teachers from the local area schools who work with preservice teachers either in practicum situations or student teaching assisted in reviewing the research related to the previously identified problems and developing the laboratory experiences to hopefully alleviate those problems.

Planning Phase

This phase of the problem solving model is what Polya identifies as the strategy selection stage. During a series of seminars with the faculty and project staff, the Field Support Team analyzed the problem areas of the preservice teachers and assisted in the development a series of objectives, that if achieved by the preservice teachers, should improve the problem areas. They also discussed the research and selected that which should be utilized with the preservice teachers.

Following is an example of an objective as developed and the research findings to be utilized with it. More than one objective is stated since the two relate to one another.

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher develops awareness of the class by:

- recognizing off-task behavior
- having an awareness of pupils in all sections of the room
- developing ways of addressing all pupils

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher is able to design and teach lessons which flow smoothly by:

- pacing the lessons
- integrating content and management
- progressing the lesson logically
- justifying the time spent on each aspect of the lesson
- introducing the lesson effectively
- providing appropriate closure
- making smooth transitions to the next activity
- giving the pupils transition signals
- dealing with interruptions in a manner that minimizes the loss of instructional time

Research Findings Indicate:

Monitoring of the classroom by the teacher includes three dimensions:

1.) Teachers watch groups, and what is happening in the entire room.

2.) Teachers watch conduct/behavior of students and particularly notice behavior that does not meet expectations. "Withit" teachers stop misbehavior early.

3.) Teachers monitor the pace, rhythm, and duration of classroom events. Smoothness and momentum characterize more effective lessons while

hesitations and lags increase off-task behavior. (Doyle, 1986, p. 414)

". . .there is a tension between the goal of maximum content coverage by pacing the students through the curriculum as rapidly as possible and the needs to: a) move in small steps so that each new objective can be learned readily and without frustration; b) see that students practice the new learning until they achieve consolidated mastery marked by smooth and correct responses; and c) where necessary, see that the students learn to integrate the new learning with other concepts and skills and to apply it efficiently in problem-solving situations." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 361)

"The pace at which the class can move will depend on the students' abilities and developmental levels, the nature of the subject matter, the student-teacher ratio, and the teacher's managerial and instructional skills." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 361)

"Students achieve more in classes where they spend most of their time being taught or supervised by their teachers rather than working on their own (or not working at all)." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 361.)

"Achievement is maximized when teachers not only actively present material, but structure it by beginning with overviews . . . and reviewing main ideas at the end. Organizing concepts and analogies helps learners link the new to the already familiar. Summary reviews integrate and reinforce the learning of major points." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 362)

"We would encourage teachers to evaluate their own instructional practices according to certain general criteria for looking at task and evaluation structures.

What opportunities do low achievers have for success in classrooms? If they do succeed, do their classmates have a chance to see and evaluate that success? Does every child know clearly what he has done that is successful and what needs to be improved? Are competitive marks and grades the only basis children have for knowing how well they are performing? Do classroom tasks and objectives provide multiple dimensions of competence? Is reading a prerequisite for successful participation on all "important" tasks? How often does the teacher use multimedia tasks and small groups? Do the better readers dominate the interaction of task groups?" (Rosenholtz & Cohen, 1983, p. 526)

With the objectives clearly defined and the research selected, the faculty moved to the next phase which is implementation.

Implementation Phase

After formulating the objectives and selecting the research to accompany them, a series of learning experiences was designed. These learning experiences would be implemented during a three semester sequence of practica and student teaching. Preservice teaches participate in early field experiences including a "communications" block practicum and a "sciences" block practicum prior to student teaching. Methods courses in these subject areas are being taught simultaneously with the practicum experience.

Warner's (1985) "research on teacher thinking suggests that teacher behavior is a by-product of information processing strategies which enable teachers to read effectively the classroom environment" (p. 55). Shulman and Elstein (1973) contend that for teachers, the raw information provided by the complexities of the classroom "far exceed(s) the capabilities or capacities of any human . . ." 3). Newell and Simon (1972) state people learn to process information in direct relationship to the purposes of their task environment. As experiences become more consistent and more

predictable information can be processed with fewer task-oriented categories. Doyle (1976) asserts that these units are schematized to reflect the "event structures of the classroom" (p. 63). He states:

Once formulated, a classroom schema enables a teacher to understand the environment, that is, recognize and interpret events and novel instances and predict possible states and directions of activities. A knowledgeable teacher can, therefore, manage a classroom with a minimum of information cues. Without this understanding the classroom remains a mass of confusion and complexity (emphasis added) (pp. 63-64).

Learning Experiences

One of the first learning experiences developed was a series of videotapes. To lessen the confusion and complexity, a series of videotapes of classroom scenes was used for cognitive discrimination training prior to the time when preservice teachers would go into the classrooms for practicum experiences.

Videotapes

An example of the videotapes developed deals with rules/procedures and teacher presence is described below.

TEACHER AS CLASSROOM LEADER

Scene One. A child has come home from school and is telling his dad about a problem. He is worried that he will "get into trouble" because his teacher has not told the class her rules and "since all teachers have rules," he is sure he will break one.

Scene Two. After a brief introduction to the tape, the scene switches to an interview by a pre-service student of two experienced teachers. The inservice teachers describe the importance of establishing clear, concise, and positively-stated rules.

Scene Three. A similar discussion among four experienced teachers follows.

Scene Four. A third grade classroom where students are developing their rules for their classroom on the beginning day of school. The teacher demonstrates an effective presence in the class- room, being sensitive to student responses. Preservice students read and discuss the research findings as cited earlier in the discussion.

A Classroom Analysis Form containing questions that will force the preservice teachers to analyze the classroom events is completed after the viewing of the videotape.

Vignettes.

Not all of the objectives for classroom analysis can be met by the use of videotapes. Descriptive vignettes that present classroom problem situations were developed for use in the laboratory practicum settings. The content of the vignettes was once again organized around the problem areas. The vignettes present the problem situation and then several possible solutions. The preservice teachers analyze the situations and solutions and determine which of the solutions they will choose to solve the problem. An example of the vignettes follows:

USING SEATWORK WISELY

Mr. Sanchez has just finished a math lesson in which he introduced the concept of multiplication to his third grade class. Half the class is working earnestly on their seatwork, that is a ditto on which they must list multiples of the numbers two through ten. The other half of the class is standing in a line in front of Mr. Sanchez with pained and quizzical expressions on their faces. He is patiently trying to deal with

each individual child, but at this rate he will never finish before P.E. The students at his desk are becoming disruptive and are distracting the children doing their seatwork.

There seem to be two basic groups in this situation. One group needs further help, while the other group seems to be having no trouble with the concept. The teacher is also under a time constraint.

Solution 1.

The teacher asks all the children to be seated. He assumes that if the majority of the students need help, then the whole class would benefit from it. He asks for the whole class' attention. The class then becomes involved in a re-teaching activity which involves doing the worksheet together. The students who are already working on the seatwork have become restless and want to call out the answers before the other students have time to think. Time comes for the class to go to P.E. The assignment is finished. The teacher takes up the papers to check on student progress.

Solution 2.

The teacher notices that there are almost as many children who need help as those who are working on the papers. He asks those in line to find a partner who is sitting at their desk. He asks the students who understand their seatwork to answer their friend's questions. A peer tutoring situation is set up. The teacher walks around the room monitoring the progress of the students. When a child understands the assignment, he is asked to go to his seat and try it again on his own.

Solution 3.

The teacher recognizes that the students in line are asking generally the same questions. He then asks them to bring their chairs and put them in a circle at the front of the room. He then asks them to put away their worksheets and pencils. He begins to re-teach the lesson at a slower pace. Many questions are asked of the children. When the teacher is satisfied with the number of children who are answering the questions correctly, he re-explains the worksheet, asks for questions and sends

them back to their desks.

Just as the preservice teachers use a Classroom Analysis Form with the videotapes, they do the same for the vignettes by attempting to select the solution that they feel will best solve the problem.

Computer Simulations.

In the computer simulation version of the vignettes, the vignette is presented in a textual manner followed by the various solutions. Students are able to move from the situation to the various solutions so that re-reading and study of the situation and various solutions is possible even if the text takes more than one computer screen. Students are asked to pick a solution and the computer program will give them feedback on their choice. If the solution is the best one the student will not only see a reinforcement statement but also the research results that support this solution. If a less effective solution is chosen, the student will receive information about why this alternative is not as appropriate, again based upon the research. The program monitors student performance and provides the instructor with a summary of each student's progress.

Videodisc

A videodisc presents a classroom situation where a teacher is using small groups for instruction. The teacher demonstrates ability, interest, and cooperative grouping with the same class of students. It is easy to discern that different students respond differently to the grouping arrangements. Experienced teachers discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each type of grouping. The videodisc also demonstrates teacher presence in the classroom, non-verbal behavior, and ways of assigning students to groups.

Preservice Student As Researcher.

"When teachers adopt a researcher's frame of mind, teaching improves. Through participation in research, teachers learn more about teaching. They learn how to look

beyond--without overlooking--the immediate, the individual, and the concrete" (Watts, 1985, p.126). The quote refers to inservice teachers, but it stands to reason that preservice teachers should benefit from such experience as well. Research techniques, particularly qualitative methods such as participant observer, are presented to the preservice teachers in their first practicum courses. A process of identifying questions for research in the classroom will occur during their practicum experience and will culminate in a research project during their senior year in student teaching. Each time they develop a more sophisticated ethnographic research study. Some examples of the research questions are "Do I call on all children in the classroom or just a few?" "How do I respond to the children's responses?" "What levels of questions do I ask?"

Self-Monitoring Activities.

"The ability to predict or to estimate task difficulty, to self-interrogate, self-test, or monitor the use of a strategy to task demands, and to make use of implicit and explicit feedback must come to underlie the education of teachers" (Meichenbaum and Asarnow, 1979, p. 29).

"Self-interrogation concerning the state of one's own knowledge during problem solving is an essential skill in a wide variety of situations, those of the laboratory; the school or everyday life." (Brown and DeLoache, 1978, p. 61). Student teachers and practicum students are encouraged to monitor lessons and self-interrogate aspects of their own teaching. Preservice practicum students self-monitor their peer teaching, micro-teaching and teaching of lessons in the classroom. They use a series of questions to guide their reflective thoughts.

Upon completion of lessons taught by the practicum student and student teacher and observed by the university supervisor, they reflect on the following questions:

1) What things went well with the lesson you just taught?

2) What things would you change about the lesson you just taught?

3) What revisions did you make in your original plan for the lesson?

4) What are your teaching goals for your next lesson?

In addition to the questions outlined above, practicum students and student teachers are encouraged to self-evaluate all lessons they teach rather than only those that are observed. A component of each lesson plan is a critique section.

Analysis of the Classroom: Student Teaching Seminars

As a result of the program development, a change in the student teaching experiences was initiated. The early introduction to the classroom is balanced with seminars utilized to present research data and the further development of analytical skills. Seminars are planned for student teachers to analyze the observation data they collect in the classroom. Student teachers spend the mornings of the first week of each of the two student teaching placements observing and becoming a part of the classroom. Afternoons are spent on campus in a seminar designed to meet the following purposes:

1.) "Bridge the gap" between university coursework/expectations and the public school classroom;

2.) Formally analyze the elementary classroom;

3.) Connect research findings to practice;

4.) Prepare for taking on the role of teacher in these classrooms;

5.) Establish a model for problem solving and conceptual development for future teaching.

Practicum Handbook and Notebook

Another activity implemented is the handbook for practicum students. The handbook includes procedures and policies of the practicum, but, additionally, provides for problem solving. Students use observation questions for their initial visits to the classroom. They have research articles to read and then relate them to their practicum experiences. They report their analysis of their teaching and self evaluation of the total experience.

Looking Back Phase

Experts on problem solving say the "looking back" phase is one of the most important and oft neglected. It is the act of looking back, reflecting, evaluating, generalizing both the problem and the solution, and relating the problem to others that incorporate the problem into the repertoire of solved problems and moves the solver to a higher level of competence.

Field Support Team

One of the most important aspects of looking back was to assess the input of the Field Support Team. The members of the Field Support Team were interviewed to determine the degree to which they thought their participation in the program development was beneficial. The questions which made up the interview were designed to elicit responses which would reveal the participants' opinions of the most important aspects of the program. Questions included those which asked about the role of the Field Support Team in program development, the individual's role in that team, the activities in which the team engaged, and the format of the Field Support Team meetings. Those interviewed were also given an opportunity to express their opinions about the program and give suggestions of activities that the Field Support Team could be involved in during the continued program development.

The general consensus of the teachers was that their role in the program development was to share the perspective of the practicing classroom teacher with those who are designing preservice teacher education programs. The teachers felt that student teachers need to be educated in programs that combine educational theory with the "real" world of the day-to-day elementary classroom. One teacher ventured that the participation of classroom teachers is designing preservice teacher education programs gave "validity to the proceedings."

Many of the teachers stressed that their participation on the Field Support Team helped them grow professionally. Involvement of the team's activities encouraged the teachers to analyze their classroom teaching and their work with preservice teachers. The seminars provided these master teachers with professional adult contact and exposure to some of the research findings that had been published since their last coursework was complete. The results of this kind of involvement included "more interest in day-to-day teaching" and the desire to "analyze the effects of various teacher behaviors" in classroom settings. The teachers also acknowledge receiving some needed positive feedback from the seminars. They found that many of their personal teaching methods were supported by research and by their peers.

Participation in the team gave the teachers a clearer view of the roles of practicum and student teaching in the teacher education process at Peabody/Vanderbilt. One teacher summarized this by stating, "It made me understand better what the student teacher had to accomplish. It was good to find specific things that a student teacher might need help with. I had never thought about helping with specific areas before."

Preservice Student Teachers As Problem Solvers

To determine the achievement of the objectives with the preservice student teachers and assess their problem solving abilities, several evaluative techniques were used.

The baseline data that were collected through formal and informal/narrative evaluations for determining the problem areas (now defined as objectives) were compared with the same type of data collected on the preservice student teachers who had completed the revised program experiences. These student teaching evaluations revealed that the project learning experiences had been successful.

During the first week of the student teachers' final placement, pre- service students observe their cooperating teachers for a one-hour block time. This observation is structured to focus on classroom management and organization. Narrative notes recorded during the observation. Student teachers describe the following aspects of the observation:

1.) The teacher's tasks observed during the hour.

2.) All "moment-to-moment" decisions the teacher made as perceived by the student teacher.

3.) Identification of any student behavior that required prior management instruction on the teacher's part.

4.) A description of the overall management procedures which seemed to be in place in the classroom.

These observations are used to identify student teachers' awareness of ways that classroom teachers address the problem areas (objectives) that have been identified.

Conclusions

The use of the problem solving model in redesigning the teacher preparation program was invaluable. By focusing on the problem areas of the preservice students, only changes that would alleviate those problems were initially made.

Reviewing the research and utilizing it with both preservice and inservice teachers gave them the opportunity to analyze their classroom behaviors relative to the research findings. Preservice students began to ask the question "What does the

research say?" when faced with a problem situation while the inservice teachers (Field Support Team) reaffirmed some of their teaching behaviors.

Technology presented us with some problems. Videotaping classroom scenes is a difficult task. Noise, outside distractions, and the attempt to avoid class disruption often prevent accurate recording of the instruction and management. However, we have found our efforts to be well worth the difficulties. The outcomes are most useful when providing preservice teachers with classroom experiences and opportunities to solve problems within those settings. The visual descriptions of the problems facilitate for students an understanding of research implications. The computer simulations have not proved as effective as we had hoped since the students expressed the belief that the written vignettes were all that were needed. Our belief is that we need to introduce more computer simulations throughout their teacher preparation program rather than concentrating them during one practicum. The videodisc has proved most valuable in focusing on specific situations and children in the classroom.

As a result of the changes made in the teacher education program, the preservice teachers are more self confident, more able to solve problems and make decisions in the classroom, more respectful of the research and its value to their classroom behaviors, and overall more effective as teachers.

REFERENCES

Bransford, J.D., Hasselbring, T.S. & Sherwood, R.D. (1986). Computers, videodiscs, and the teaching of thinking. Technical Report 86.1.1., Learning Technology Center. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.

Bransford, J.D., Sherwood, R.D., Kinzer, C.K., & Hasselbring, T.S. (1985). Havens for learning: Toward a framework for developing effective uses of technology. Technical Report 85.1.1., Learning Technology Center. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.

Brophy, J., & Good, T.L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, (3rd ed.) (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Brown, A.L. & DeLoache, J.S. (1978). Skills, plans and self-regulation. In R.S. Siegler (Ed.), Children's thinking: What develops? Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, E.G. (1972). Sociology and the classroom: Setting the conditions for teacher-student interaction. Review of Educational Research, 42, 441-452.

Cuban, L. (1984). Policy and research dilemmas in the teaching of reasoning: Unplanned designs. Review of Educational Research, 54(4), 655-681.

Dickson, W.P. (1982). Two decades of referential communication research: A review and meta-analysis. In C.J. Brainerd & M. Pressley (Eds.), Progress in cognitive development research, Vol. 2. Verbal processes in children. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Doyle, W. (1979). Making managerial decisions in classrooms. In D.L. Duke (Ed.) Classroom management. (Yearbook of the National

Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Doyle, W. (1980). Classroom organization and management. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. (3rd ed.) (pp. 392-431). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Dunkin, M., & Biddle, B. (1974). The study of teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Evertson, C.M., & Emmer, E.T. (1982). Preventive classroom management. In D.L. Duke (Ed.), ASCD Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.

Fisher, C.W., Berliner, D.C., Filby, N.N., Dishaw, M.M. (1981). Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: An overview. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 17(1), 2-15.

Fisher, C.W., Filby, N.N., & Marliave, R.S. (1977). Descriptions of distributions of ALT within and across classes during B-C period. Technical Note IV-1b. In Beginning teacher evaluation study. Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Hamacheck, D. (1969). Characteristics of good teachers and implications for teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan. 50, 341-5.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University Press of Chicago.

Marks, M.B. (1978-1979). From the editor-in-chief . . . Educational Research Quarterly ,3(4), 5.

McKibbin, M. (1978-1979). Thinking and training: The meaning of the South Bay study for inservice education. Educational Research Quarterly, 3(4), 78-82.

Meichenbaum, D. & Asarnow, J. (1979). Cognitive behavior modification

and meta-cognitive development: Implications for the classroom. In P. Kendal & S. Hollon (Eds.), Cognitive - behavioral interventions: Theory, research, and procedures. New York: Academic Press.

Morine, G. (1976). A study of teacher planning. Technical Report 76-3-1, Beginning teacher evaluation study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Education Research and Development.

Newell, A., & Simon, H.A. (1972). Human problem solving. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Piaget, J. (1967). Six psychological studies. New York: Random House.

Polya, G. (1957). How to solve it. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor.

Redfield, D., & Rousseau, E. (1981). A meta-analysis of experimental research on teacher questioning behavior. Review of Educational Research, 51, 237-245.

Rich, J.M. (1984). Discipline, Rules, and Punishment. Contemporary Education, 55(2), 110-112.

Rosenholtz, S. & Cohen, E. (1983). Back for basics and the desegregated school. Elementary School Journal, 83, 515-527.

Rowe, M.B. (1974). Wait-time and rewards as instructional variables. Their influence on language, logic, and fate control: Part one-- Wait-time. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11(2), 81-94.

Sherwood, R.D., Bransford, J.D., & Kinzer, C.K. (1986). The development of videodisc based environments to facilitate science instruction Journal of Research in Science Teaching, in review.

Shulman, L.S., & Elstein, A.S (1975). Studies of problem solving, judgment,

and decision-making: Implications for educational research. In F.N. Kerlinger (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (Vol.3) Hasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock.

Slavin, R. (1977). Classroom reward structure: An analytical and practical review. Review of Educational Research, 47(4), 633-650.

Slavin, R. (1980). Cooperative learning. Review of Educational Research, 50, 315-342.

Tinsley, D.C. (1973). Use of questions. Educational Leadership, 30, 710-711.

Warner, D. (1985). Using cognitive discrimination training to develop classroom knowledge. Journal of Teacher Education, 55-61.

Watts, H. (1985). When teachers are researchers, teaching improves. Journal of Staff Development, 6(2), 118-27.

Wilen, W.W. and Clegg, A.A., Jr. (1986). Effective questions and questioning: A research review. Theory and Research in Social Education, 14(2), 153-161.

II. Major Issues, Strategies and Collaboration Approaches

The major issues of the project were to identify the problem areas of the students in our early childhood/elementary teacher preparation program and to design learning experiences to alleviate those problems. These foci did not change over the three years except to include the student teaching experiences as well as the early field experiences (practica).

Problem solving strategies were chosen to address the issues since we were attempting to solve the problems our students were having. They were very effective in achieving the objectives of the project.

An Advisory Committee and a Field Support Team collaborated with the Project staff in defining the project goals; designing learning activities to accomplish them and in evaluating the outcomes. They will review the draft final report and make comments before the final report is completed. The members of these groups included researchers, classroom teachers who work with our student teachers and practicum students; and administrators in the districts where our students participate in field experiences.

III. Major Outcomes

As a result of the project, the problem areas in teaching that were experienced by our preservice teachers were reduced. By participating in the newly developed learning experiences, the preservice teachers are more self confident, more able to solve problems and make decisions in the classroom, more respectful of the research and its value to their classroom behaviors, and overall more effective as teachers.

The outcomes were expected and after using the materials with several groups of students, the outcomes can be trusted. I believe we achieved these outcomes because we identified the problems and then designed very specific learning experiences to overcome them.

We now use the materials designed for the project with every group of students in the early childhood/elementary teacher preparation program. We do this because we have found them to be effective.

IV. Implications for Others.

Any teacher education program in a local college or university or nationally can employ the same process to determine the problem areas in their program. They can then use materials we have designed for our problem areas or design those that are more compatible with their program. For example, if their students are having difficulty in being aware of all students in the classroom, then they may want to secure a copy of a videotape that we developed to make students aware of this problem.

Any institution can use the process we have used. The value of our products for them would be determined by the problems in the program that they identify.

V. Institutionalized Features of the Project

All products of the project will be continued in the regular program after September 30, 1988. The members of the faculty who work with the practica of student programs will be responsible for the continuation of their use. As Chair of the department, I will be responsible for orienting new faculty and graduate students to the use of the products. It is anticipated that the university resources will be sufficient to continue the implementation. However, additional materials such as videotapes and videodiscs will have to be developed more slowly as existing resources are used. Other funding agencies will also be pursued for continued experimentation.

Certainly the project provided the opportunity to develop these products for use much more quickly than would have been possible with university resources. The process had begun, but without release time for faculty and graduate assistant help, it would have been much longer in accomplishment and might possibly gone in a different direction than the use of technology.

VII. Overall Strengths and Weaknesses and "Lessons" Learned

The videotapes, videodisc and written materials such as vignettes and instruments were the strengths of the project. The collaboration with the field support team during the first and third years also was a strength. The composition (too large) and activities of the second year field support team were a weakness. Our computer simulation format has evolved over the three years of the project, but still appears to be our major weakness. We will need to further evaluate and adapt the format of the computer simulation until it proves effective or abandon it.

A real strength of the project was the project staff including faculty and particularly the capable graduate students who assisted with the project. The problem solving process that the project staff was involved in was as much a strength of the project as any of its products.

If the opportunity would present itself, another year or two to refine the products of the project would be helpful. It seems that preparing reports and collecting data sapped some of the time that could have been spent on preparing further materials.

One of the major lessons to be learned was to select the field support team members during the first year and continue with them even though some attrition might occur. Bringing in new members during the second year lessened the productivity of the group since the new members needed to be brought "up to date" which was most difficult since the process of the project was equally as important as the product outcomes.

IV. Products and Dissemination Activities

Products Developed

A. Videotape-Teacher As Classroom Leader. Presents a teacher on the first day of school and demonstrates how she develops classrooms rules with the children.

B. Videodisc-With expert teacher commentary, the teacher demonstrates the

organization of small groups for instruction using ability, interest and cooperative formats. Copies available for purchase.

C. Vignettes-Classroom problem situations for preservice teachers to select solutions from.

D. Computer simulations-classroom problem situations that have the relevant research presented to help preservice teachers select the appropriate solutions.

E. Instruments-observation instruments both practicum and student teaching that link with the learning experiences that were designed.

Dissemination Activities

A. Presentation of paper entitled "Using Research, Problem Solving, and Technology to Improve Teacher Education" at American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education convention, February, 1988, New Orleans. Over 150 present. Numerous requests for the paper.

B. Presentation of paper entitled "Promoting Problem Solving in Teacher Education: Documenting Changes and Analyzing Outcomes" at Association of Teacher Educators convention, February 16, 1988, San Diego, California.

C. The paper presented at the ATE convention is to be compiled with other papers presented at that convention into a publication. This publication will be prepared by The Network.

D. A presentation made at the American Conference of Teachers of Foreign Language entitled "A Videotape Program for Developing Decision Making Skills." The convention was held March, 1988 in Nashville, Tenn. The Foreign Language journal editor has requested an article be written for their publication.

E. A paper entitled "How Do We Prepare Teachers: Using Research, Problem Solving, and Technology to Improve Teacher Education" presented at the American Educational Research Association convention, April, 1988, in New Orleans. Twenty-five requests for the paper have been made. The paper is now in the ERIC system.

SPO30108

F. A paper entitled "Improving Teacher Education" has been presented for publication in Educational Leadership. Paper was rejected. Being revised.

Future Plans

Plans have been made to develop instructional guides to be used with our products. These will be advertised in appropriate journals.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

Peabody PreService Teachers As Problem Solvers

Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

September, 1988

Project Director	Dorothy J. Skeel
Associate Director	Ann Neely
Technical Consultants	Robert Sherwood
	Carol Hamlett
Graduate Assistants	Gretchen Caskey
	Tina Whitfield
	Deborah Griffith
	Emily Beardsley

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

Peabody PreService Teachers As Problem Solvers

Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

September, 1988

Project Director	Dorothy J. Skeel
Associate Director	Ann Neely
Technical Consultants	Robert Sherwood
	Carol Hamlett
Graduate Assistants	Gretchen Caskey
	Tina Whitfield
	Deborah Griffith
	Emily Beardsley

Faculty Consultants Professors	Elizabeth Goldman Cliff Hofwolt Victoria Risko Charles Kinzer
Advisory Committee	Dean Willis Hawley Professor Carolyn Evertson Professor John Bransford Principal George Kersey Teacher Meredith Henderson Professor Jane Stallings
Field Support Team	Meredith Henderson Jackie Baker Lynn Noll Elaine Fahrner Jill Waddell

Supported by a grant from the Office of
Educational Research and Improvement

Program Assessment Report

I. Major Questions

The Department of Teaching and Learning of Peabody College/Vanderbilt University developed a project to strengthen field experiences for elementary/early childhood teacher education students. The project was designed to use current research to revise the laboratory/practica programs, incorporating technology and simulated classroom experiences. The ultimate goal was to develop teachers who would be problem solvers - - able to assess each unique classroom situation and select from alternative strategies the strategy that would be the "best fit."

Major questions guiding the development of the project were:

What are the problems that Peabody elementary/early childhood preservice teachers have during practica and student teaching?

What impact did the learning experiences of the Peabody project have on the problem areas of the elementary/early childhood preservice teachers?

What are the instructional processes used in the practica and student teaching to improve the problem solving and reflective processes of the preservice teachers?

How well do the objectives and practica experiences reflect the research?

How effective was the use of technology in the preparation of preservice teachers?

How effective was the use of an advisory committee and field support team in redesigning a teacher education program?

II. Program Description

The initial intent of the project was to focus on the field experiences (practica) of the elementary/early childhood preservice teachers. These experiences occur in the methods blocks (communications and sciences) prior to the student teaching. However after the initial implementation of the project activities occurred, the student teaching component also was included. Juniors and seniors spent three semesters while enrolled in the communications (language arts and reading) practicum, sciences,(math, science and social studies) practicum, and student teaching as participants in the project. During the practica and student teaching, preservice teachers were involved in learning experiences especially designed for the project including ethnographic research methods, vignettes of classroom situations, computer simulations, videotapes, videodiscs teaching analysis, peer teaching, microteaching, observations and seminars.

An advisory committee composed of researchers and practitioners and a field support team of practicing classroom teachers collaborated with the project staff to review the research and design the project activities.

III. Sample

Each semester since the fall of 1986, between 50-60 elementary/early childhood students have participated in a three semester sequence of learning experiences during their communication and sciences practica and their student teaching.

IV. Methodology

To enable the project staff to answer the major questions of the project,

data from a variety of sources were collected.

Question 1: What are the problems that Peabody elementary/early childhood preservice teachers have during practica and student teaching?

During the fall semester 1985, the elementary and early childhood student teachers' assessment data were compiled. Eight informal evaluations per student were conducted during the initial student teaching placement. These narrative evaluations were reviewed and common problems were noted. General findings indicated problems with lesson transitions, lesson flow, awareness of total class, and adjusting lessons when needed.

Formal evaluations of student teachers by the University supervisors and cooperating teachers were used in determining additional growth areas. These evaluations indicated that overall improvement was needed in questioning, making modification in instruction, and making and stating rules.

Through videotapes and performance in field experiences, practica students from fall semester 1985 provided further data. Analyses of these sources indicated general areas of growth needed in seatwork assignments, behavior toward high and low achieving students, reacting to student responses, uses of punishment, student responsibilities, and flow of lessons. In reviewing the research on beginning teachers (Veenman, 1984), many of the perceived problems were similar to those noted in our investigation.

Question 2: What are the instructional processes used in the practica and student teaching to improve the problem solving and reflective processes of preservice teachers?

During both practicum classes and student teaching, preservice teachers were introduced to ethnographic research methods to be used by them to analyze and reflect on their own teaching as well as that of others. They completed three mini-

ethnographies during a three semester sequence.

A series of vignettes presenting classroom situations with problems were introduced to the students for their analysis and determination of a solution. A series of videotapes gives a visual representation of classroom problems as well. Also problems are presented in computer simulations with the research related to the problem and possible solutions.

After each lesson is taught in practica or student teaching, preservice teachers are requested to respond to reflective questions about their teaching. The following questions are suggested:

1. What things went well with the lesson you just taught?
2. What things would you change about the lesson you just taught?
3. What revisions did you make in your original plan for the lesson?
4. What are your teaching goals for your next lesson?

Question 3: <u>What impact did the learning experiences of the Peabody project have on the problem areas of the elementary/early childhood preservice teachers?</u>

To determine the impact of the project activities on the preservice teachers,the problems that students were having were redefined in the form of objectives to be achieved. The objectives were in turn redefined in an observation instrument that would be used during the time when the students were teaching in the sciences practicum which is a whole class experience. Both of these can be found in Appendix A.

In addition, students responded to an evaluation form whereby they rated each of the experiences in which they had participated to indicate how they felt each would be helpful in preparing them to begin classroom teaching. They completed the rating form before going into the classroom and after they had begun teaching. Interviews were

conducted with the practicum students to further determine how the project experiences had affected them. Students maintained a journal during their "sciences" practicum on observation instruments, establishing their presence in the classroom, teaching analysis, self evaluation, and their ethnographies. These journal entries were analyzed. The evaluation form and interview questions can be found in Appendix A.

Student teachers were evaluated through the same processes that were used to identify the problem areas. The first group to complete the three semester sequence were evaluated in the Spring of 1988.

Question 4: How well do the objectives and practica experiences reflect the research?

After the objectives were defined, the review of the research produced research data to match each of the objectives. Research supports each learning experience developed for the preservice teachers. This is included in Appendix A with the objectives.

Question 5: How effective was the use of technology in the preparation of preservice teachers?

Preservice teachers rate the learning experiences including those developed through technology to determine their help in preparing them for actual classroom teaching. Without the use of technology, problem solving through videotapes, videodisc and computer simulations would have been impossible. Bringing the reality of the actual classroom into the prepracticum experience is important.

Question 6: How effective was the use of an advisory committee and field support team in redesigning a teacher education program?

The field support team was interviewed to determine the degree to which they thought their participation in the program development was beneficial. The questions

that made up the interview were designed to elicit responses which would reveal the participants' opinions of the most important aspects of the program.

Input from the advisory committee was presented to the field support team to solicit their reactions to it.

V. Instrumentation

Practicum Observation Form - This form is used during observation of practicum students teaching the whole class. The form as developed uses the objectives that had been written from the problem areas for the items to be rated on a 1 - 5 scale. Observers were trained using videotapes until there was at least an 85% agreement on the ratings of preservice teacher behaviors.

Student Teaching Evaluation A formal evaluation is completed at the end of each student teaching placement by the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

Teaching Analysis Form - A form designed to elicit reflective responses from students after they have completed teaching a lesson.

Interview Schedule - A series of structured questions to elicit feedback from preservice teachers regarding their perceptions of their teaching experience in the practicum.

Classroom Analysis Form - A form used to elicit responses from preservice teachers for the classroom problems that are presented as vignettes and videotapes.

Practicum Evaluation - Preservice teachers rate the effectiveness of the learning activities that were presented in practicum before they go into the classroom. They used the rating form again after having taught several lessons.

Initial Observation Form - A series of questions designed to assist the preservice teacher in becoming familiar with the procedures and students in the practicum classroom.

Second and Third Observation Form - A series of questions designed to assist the preservice teacher in becoming familiar with the instructional program in the practicum classroom.

A copy of these instruments may be found in Appendix B.

VI Results/Findings

Question 1 and 2 were answered in the initial presentation of them. These were implementation questions and were answered as the project evolved.

Question 3: Practicum students in the sciences block who were teaching the whole class were observed and evaluated three times during the experience. This practicum class in Fall of 1986 had 10 students. Their mean scores on the final observation appear in Appendix B. Using a 5 point scale 1 being low and 5 high, all means are 4.0 or above. Some of the key items that are directly related to the problem areas that had improved were makes pupils aware of the rules, 4.6; assumes a "teacher presence" in the classroom, 4.8; allows wait time for responses, 4.6; progresses the lesson logically, 4.8; and awareness of pupils in all sections of classroom, 4.3.

During the Spring semester 1987, the sciences block practicum students were randomly assigned to two equal groups (9 students). The experimental group remained on campus initially to participate in the new content and learning experiences (vignettes, videotapes, etc.) while the control group went immediately into the school classroom to begin the practicum experiences. After five weeks, when the experimental group went into the schools, the control group returned to the campus for the learning experiences, before returning to the field for the final three weeks of practicum.

A series of t-tests was calculated to compare the experimental and control group on each individual item of each observation, on clusters of items under each of the main objectives of the course, and on overall observations. Table 1 gives the means

and standard deviations for the experimental and control group for Observation 1. Few of the items showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups. The small number of statistically significant t-tests could be explained by the very small sample size (17 in most cases) and the small rating scale (1 to 5), allowing for only small variance between ratings.

Even though not statistically significant, it is important to look at the differences in the means on observation one for the two groups. This is the observation taken at the time the experimental group had received the training and the control group had not. The means on individual items for the experimental group are higher than the means for the control group on Observation 1 in 64% of the cases. This indicates that the group with new content and experiences performed better than the group without training on a majority of items on the rating scale. Table 2 gives the means and standard deviations for the experimental and control groups for Observation 3. After both groups had received training (Observation 3) the experimental group had far fewer means higher than the control group (only 24% with two equal means).

As stated earlier, clusters of items were also organized under each of the objectives of the course. The cluster titles and the items contained in each cluster are listed n Table 1. One cluster in Observation 1 was found to be statistically significant at a .007 level when the t-test was performed. This is the cluster entitled "Knowledge of Questioning Techniques." Items included under this cluster are: uses substantive, higher level questions focusing on objectives; allows wait time for responses; and listens to student responses for guidance in developing the following questions. All of these items were included during the campus learning experiences.

A t-test was also performed on the means of the first two observations, before training, and the last two observations, after training, for the control group. There was a statistically significant difference between the observations. The mean of two

observations after training (205.18) was significantly higher than the mean (177.13) of the first two observations before training at a .02 level. Training appears to have improved the teaching skills of these students.

The self evaluations that students completed at the end of the semester were compared with the evaluations done by the cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers listed many more strengths than weaknesses for the students. Further, the strengths listed by the teachers, in a majority of the cases, matched the objectives defined for the course and the project.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Experimental and Control Groups for Practicum Observation 1

OBSERVATION 1		N=9 Experimental Mean	S.D.	N=9 Control Mean	S.D.	t-value	Prob
a.	Awareness of the Classroom						
1.	Recognizes off-task behavior	3.14	.69	3.00	1.00	.32	.752
2.	Awareness of pupils in all sections of classroom	3.88	.99	3.33	1.12	1.05	.310
3.	Develops ways of addressing all pupils	3.81	.65	3.25	.71	1.66	.120
B.	Ability to use the rules in the classroom;						
4.	Makes pupils aware of the rules	3.25	1.91	2.00	1.41	1.55	.143
5.	Monitors the rules and uses consistent enforcement of them	3.14	.90	2.63	1.06	1.01	.330
6.	Uses a variety of strategies to deal with disruptive pupil behavior	3.40	1.14	2.71	.95	1.14	.282
C.	Effective use of personality in the classroom						
7.	Assumes a "teacher presence" in the classroom	3.88	.99	3.89	.93	-.03	.977
8.	Shows enthusiasm for teaching and children	4.13	.99	4.11	.78	.03	.975
9.	Uses a variety of expressions and voice inflections	3.75	1.04	3.56	.53	.50	.626
10.	Makes use of non-verbal expressions	3.25	1.04	3.67	.50	-1.08	.298
11.	Sensitiveness	4.00	.76	4.22	.44	-.75	.464
12.	Dresses professionally	4.50	.54	4.56	.53	-.22	.832

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

		N=9 Experimental Mean	S.D.	N=9 Control Mean	S.D.	t-value	Prob
D.	Reaction to Student Responses						
13.	Listens actively	4.38	.52	4.33	.50	.17	.868
14.	Talks with students, not at them	4.25	.46	4.33	.50	-.36	.728
15.	Uses language appropriate for grade level	4.00	.54	4.00	.71	.00	1.00
E.	Knowledge of Questioning Technique						
16.	Uses substantive, higher level questions focusing on objectives	4.00	1.00	3.44	1.29	.17	.218
17.	Allows wait time for responses	4.00	.54	3.78	.67	.75	.464
18.	Listens to student responses for guidance in developing the following questions	4.25	.71	3.00	.50	4.25	.001*
F.	Ability to design and teach lessons						
19.	Paces the lessons	4.13	.35	3.56	.73	2.01	.063
20.	Integrates content and management	3.25	.89	3.38	.74	-.31	.764
21.	Progresses the lesson logically	4.25	.46	3.89	.60	1.37	.190
22.	Justifies the time spent on each aspect of the lesson	4.13	.99	3.22	.67	2.23	.042*
23.	Introduces the lesson effect-	4.25	.71	4.00	.50	.85	.409
24.	Provides appropriate closure	4.00	.89	4.14	.38	-.39	.707
25.	Deals with interruptions in a manner that minimizes the loss of instructional time	3.17	.75	3.43	.54	-.73	.479

*Significant Items

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Experimental and Control Groups for Practicum Observation 3

		N=9 Experimental Mean	S.D.	N=9 Control Mean	S.D.	t-value	Prob
OBSERVATION 3							
A.	Awareness of the Classroom						
1.	Recognizes off-task behavior	3.00	1.10	3.00	.87	.00	1.00
2.	Awareness of pupils in all sections of classroom	3.17	.99	3.22	1.09	-.10	.922
3.	Develops ways of addressing all pupils	3.50	.55	3.44	.53	.20	.847
B.	Ability to use the rules in the classroom						
4.	Makes pupils aware of the rules	3.50	1.521	3.38	.921	.19	.851
5.	Monitors the rules and uses consistent enforcement of them	4.00	.89	3.38	1.06	1.16	.267
6.	Uses a variety of strategies to deal with disruptive pupil behavior	2.83	.75	2.43	.54	1.13	.282
C.	Effective use of personality in the classroom						
7.	Assumes a "teacher presence" in the classroom	4.00	.63	3.89	.60	.34	.737
8.	Shows enthusiasm for teaching and children	3.50	1.23	4.11	.78	-1.19	.256
9.	Uses a variety of expressions and voice inflections	3.00	.89	3.78	.83	-1.72	.109
10.	Makes use of non-verbal expressions	3.17	.75	3.67	.71	-1.31	.213
11.	Sensitiveness	3.60	1.52	4.11	.78	-.85	.414
12.	Dresses professionally	4.33	.52	4.22	.67	.34	.737

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

		N=9 Experimental Mean	S.D.	N=9 Control Mean	S.D.	t-value	Prob
D.	Reaction to Student Responses						
13.	Listens actively	3.33	1.03	4.33	.71	-2.24	.043*
14.	Talks with students, not at them	3.67	1.03	4.33	.71	-1.49	.159
15.	Uses language appropriate for grade level	4.33	.52	4.44	.73	-.32	.752
E.	Knowledge of Questioning Technique						
16.	Uses substantive, higher level questions focusing on objectives	3.50	1.00	3.63	.92	-.22	.833
17.	Allows wait time for responses	4.33	.82	4.33	.50	.00	1.00
18.	Listens to student responses for guidance in developing the following questions	3.33	.82	4.00	.71	-1.68	.116
F.	Ability to design and teach lessons						
19.	Paces the lessons	3.33	.52	4.00	.54	-2.34	.037*
20.	Integrates content and management	3.17	1.17	3.44	.88	-.53	.608
21.	Progresses the lesson logically	4.00	.63	4.44	.53	-1.48	.163
22.	Justifies the time spent on each aspect of the lesson	3.60	.89	3.63	.74	-.05	.957
23.	Introduces the lesson effect-	3.00	1.10	4.29	.49	-2.81	.017*
24.	Provides appropriate closure	3.20	.45	4.25	.71	-2.95	.013*
25.	Deals with interruptions in a manner that minimizes the loss of instructional time	3.00	1.27	3.17	.41	-.31	.765

*Significant Items

The data on the student teachers were collected at the end of the Spring Semester 1988. They had completed the three semester sequence of the project-two practica and student teaching.

During Spring 1988, there were eighteen (18) student teachers who had completed the three semester sequence of experiences that had been designed for the project. This was the first group to have completed all experiences except the use of the videodisc.

The student teachers were evaluated on a Student Teaching Performance Rating Scale by their cooperating teacher and their university supervisor four times during the student teaching semester. In the fall of 1985 when the initial problems of student teachers were identified for the project, the rating on the second evaluation of the student teacher was used. This was at the completion of their first student teaching placement after eight weeks in the classroom. There were eleven students in the group. The items on that initial form have been slightly revised. Also, a four point scale was used in Fall 1985 while a five point scale is now being used for the Spring 1988.

Table 3 gives the means of the items on the Student Teaching Performance Rating Scale for Fall 1985. These are based on a four point scale. The initial problems were in questioning, making modification in instruction, and making and stating rules. Overall, the ratings were lower for the student teachers in Fall, 1985 before the new learning experiences had been implemented.

Table 4 gives the mean score ratings for the Spring 1988 student teachers at the same time in the semester, the second evaluation. There are two ratings for each student including that of the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. These ratings are based on a five point scale. All of the ratings are between a 4 which identifies good performance and 5 which signifies outstanding performance. It is heartening to see the highest mean score, 4.85 on item 15 "conducts creative lessons

Table 3

Mean Student Teaching Ratings Second Evaluation Fall 1985

Student Teaching Performance Rating Scale:

1 = Inadequate performance
2 = Performance needs improvement
3 = Good performance
4 = Outstanding performance
N/O = Not observed
S/E = Superior (Performance in this area is more like that of an exceptional in-service teacher)

Evaluations			
1st	2nd		
		PLANNING SKILLS	
___	3.44	1.	Does appropriate written planning
___	3.02	2.	Uses formal and informal diagnostic results in teaching
___	3.33	3.	Plans for self-evaluation and written critique
		EVALUATION SKILLS	
___	3.22	4.	Records of individual student progress are maintained
___	3.19	5.	Uses formal and informal evaluation techniques
___	3.03	6.	Makes revisions in lessons based on evaluation results
		INSTRUCTIONAL AND MANAGEMENT SKILLS	
___	3.11	7.	Organizes time, space, materials and equipment
___	3.44	8.	Uses a variety of appropriate teaching aids
___	3.39	9.	Conducts creative lessons using a variety of methods
___	3.33	10.	Encourages creative work by students
___	3.17	11.	Uses questioning to reinforce and encourage learners
___	3.33	12.	Provides oral feedback to learners about progress

1st	2nd		
___	3.06	13.	Uses appropriate methods of instruction matching the needs of:
___	3.09		a. small groups
___	3.00		b. large groups
___	3.22		c. individuals
___	3.22	14.	Involves learners throughout instruction
___	3.31	15.	Makes modifications in instruction when needed
___	3.07	16.	Communicates effectively by:
___	2.94		a. explaining assignments and directions clearly
___	3.39		b. writing legibly without errors in grammar
___	3.33		c. spelling correctly
___	3.33		d. using speech which is free of errors in grammar
___	2.11		e. using voice and speech to enhance instruction
___	2.69	17.	Manages student interactions by:
___	3.08		a. establishing guidelines for acceptable behavior
___	2.97		b. addressing problems with a minimum of instructional interference
___	3.17		c. providing positive feedback to students about their behavior
___	2.94		d. implementing appropriate classroom discipline procedures

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

___	3.44	18.	Communicates personal enthusiasm for the learner, the class and the subject
___	3.50	19.	Demonstrates respect for all cultures
___	3.61	20.	Demonstrates sensitivity, patience, and a sense of humor
___	3.64	21.	Accepts constructive criticism from supervisor and cooperating teacher and plans for improvement
___	3.72	22.	Maintains professional appearance
___	3.50	23.	Attends to responsibilities in a prompt and dependable manner

1at	2nd		
___	3.64	24.	Follows policies and procedures
___	3.69	25.	Exhibits cooperation and professional attitude.

Table 4

Mean Ratings of Student Teaching (2nd evaluation) Spring 1988

STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE:

1 = Inadequate performance

2 = Performance is weak

3 = Performance has improved and needs to continue to do so

4 = Good performance

5 = Outstanding performance

N/O = Not observed

S/E = Superior (Performance in this area is more like that of an exceptional inservice teacher)

Evaluations			
1st	2nd		
		PLANNING SKILLS	
____	4.54	1.	Does appropriate written planning for daily lessons
____	4.68	2.	Does appropriate written planning for an integrated unit
____	4.41	3.	Effectively plans ahead of time
____	4.47	4.	Plans for self-evaluation and written critique
		EVALUATION SKILLS	
____	4.40	5.	Records of individual student progress are maintained
____	4.46	6.	Uses formal and informal evaluation techniques in teaching
____	4.49	7.	Makes revisions in lessons based on evaluation results
		INSTRUCTIONAL AND MANAGEMENT SKILLS	
____	4.56	8.	Organizes space, materials and equipment
____	4.49	9.	Uses instructional time effectively and efficiently
____	4.67	10.	Involves learners throughout instruction
____	4.56	11.	Makes modifications in instruction when needed
____	4.69	12.	Uses questioning to reinforce and encourage learners
____	4.46	13.	Provides oral feedback to learners about progress

1st	2nd		
		14.	Uses appropriate methods of instruction matching the needs of:
___	4.69	a.	small groups
___	4.56	b.	large groups
___	4.60	c.	individuals
___	4.85	15.	Conducts creative lessons using a variety of methods
___	4.68	16.	Encourages creative work by students
		17.	Communicates effectively by:
___	4.31	a.	explaining assignments and directions clearly
___	4.77	b.	writing legibly without errors in grammar
___	4.82	c.	spelling correctly
___	4.85	d.	using speech which is free of errors in grammar
___	4.41	e.	using voice and speech to enhance instruction
		18.	Manages student interactions by:
___	4.41	a.	establishing guidelines for acceptable behavior
___	4.49	b.	implementing appropriate classroom discipline procedures
___	4.56	c.	providing positive feedback to students about their behavior
___	4.28	d.	addressing problems with a minimum of instructional interference

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

___	4.71	19.	Communicates personal enthusiasm for the learner, the class, and the subject
___	4.64	20.	Demonstrates respect for all cultures
___	4.79	21.	Demonstrates sensitivity, patience, and a sense of humor
___	4.51	22.	Helps learners develop positive self-concepts
___	4.77	23.	Attends to responsibilites in a prompt and dependable manner
___	4.87	24.	Exhibits cooperation throughout experience

1st	2nd	
___	4.85	25. Maintains professional appearance
___	4.85	26. Follows policies and procedures
___	4.92	27. Accepts constructive criticism from supervisor and cooperatin teacher
___	4.72	28. Establishes personal teaching goals and plans for improvemen
___	4.79	29. Exemplifies a professional attitude

using a variety of methods," since one of our overall goals was to prepare pre-service teachers to use a number of alternative methods dependent upon the situation. The lowest rating occurred on the item 18d "addressing problems with a minimum of instructional interference." However, this item's rating is still within the good range.

Overall, these ratings underline the success of the project. To have student teachers receive these high ratings while only halfway through their student teaching indicates that they were well prepared for the task.. No student received a 1 or 2 on any item and only a few 3's were reported on some items.

Question 5: Preservice Teacher Interviews

Taped interviews were conducted with practicum students individually after the practicum was completed in Spring 1987. This was the practicum that was divided into experimental and control groups to determine the effectiveness of the project learning experiences. Each was asked a series of questions during the interview (see Appendix B). Transcriptions of the interview data were made, and practicum students' responses to the questions were then summarized and separated into experimental and control groups for comparison.

Interview data revealed that practicum students in the control group experienced a greater degree of discomfort when first going out into the field experience than did practicum students in the experimental group, who participated in the campus lab experience (CLE) prior to going out into the field experience. Although the experimental group expressed feelings of nervousness about going into the field experience, reflected in comments such as "I was nervous, but not as nervous as I would've been in the beginning semester..." and "[I was] a little scared, glad I had the class beforehand...", the control group was more emphatic in their feelings of being unprepared and uncertain about how to proceed. Among their comments were "[I was] totally clueless - I really had no idea what I was supposed to do..."; "I didn't feel prepared at all when I went out there... , and "I felt like I was out there way too

early and I wanted to be back here, doing the classroom part."

While 55% of the experimental group practicum students reported feeling confident about their teaching either all along or after the first lesson, only 22% of the control group practicum students reported the same. Many of those in the control group also expressed a need for more time spent in their methods classes prior to going out into the field experience: "I hadn't had enough in my methods courses to know how to teach science, social studies or math. I just didn't know what was expected of me." Thirty-three percent of the control group did express more confidence after going back into the field experience the second time. When asked when they began to feel more confident about their teaching, their answers specified "Right when I went back the second time...I felt much more comfortable" and "the second lesson I taught after going back the second time...I was excited to teach!"

All but one of the sciences practicum students in the control group had previously taken the communications practicum, whereas the sciences practicum students in the experimental group were split fairly evenly between those who had taken the communications practicum (5) and those who had not (4). Practicum students from both groups reported that having the communications block practicum contributed to a higher level of confidence. The interview comments indicated that greater efficacy in the teacher role resulted from previous involvement in the communications practicum. Comments included "I'd been out in a teacher world before;" "You develop your own feeling about yourself when you're teaching, and I'd already done that so it made it a little easier."

Many practicum students pointed out the benefit of moving from teaching a small group in the communications practicum to teaching the whole class in the sciences practicum. As one recalled, "I was going from a small group to a large group, and you had a lot more to handle all at once: a lot more management, a lot more group activities. I liked feeling comfortable with myself before I had to deal with all of them put together. It's a natural building process."

The groups differed in their responses about which activities they found most

helpful in applying to their field experience. Experimental group practicum students listed peer teaching and microteaching most frequently, and their comments enthusiastically reflected how these activities from the CLE contributed to the field experience. Peer and microteaching, they said, "definitely helped, because I got to practice...that was my first time ever teaching a class...;" "Peer and microteaching were probably the most helpful [activities]...; I got up in front and actually practiced the TABA model...," and "that's what you were actually going to be doing."

The experimental group practicum students also had favorable comments about research articles and the videotapes. They said, "I used a lot of the article on classroom management that we read, like stating beforehand what we were going to do, what the rules were going to be, and reviewing with them every time before I taught," and "Watching some of those teachers in action [in the videotapes] helped me;" "When I get out in my classroom I'll know how to do it."

Control group practicum students listed the research articles most frequently when asked which CLE activities had applicability to the field experience. This group also felt that peer teaching and the vignette activities had applicability to their field experiences. One practicum student pointed out that "the vignettes helped a lot, just because a lot of times you'll get put in a situation, and it's nice to talk about them with people before you actually have it happen. A lot of experiences won't necessarily happen in your practicum that will happen when you teach, and it's nice to have them in the vignettes." Although the videotapes were not mentioned as frequently as other CLE activities by the control group, those practicum students who did find the tapes helpful shared comments such as "I thought the classroom rules videotape was great. I had always wondered about what I was going to do on the first day of school!"

Preservice students rate the effectiveness of the learning experience to give their perceptions of how helpful they will be in preparing them for their classroom practicum. A copy of the form can be found in Appendix B. The results from Fall, 1987 after the students had been teaching in the classroom can be found in Table 3 below. On a five point scale with 5 high and 1 being low, the means for all of

activities, but vignettes and computer simulation are above 4.0. The video disc was not completed in time to field test with the spring practicum group, so the effectiveness of it will not be included in the evaluation.

Table 3

Means of Student Evaluations of Learning Experiences Fall 1987

N = 10

Learning Experience	Mean
Ethnography Video	4.0
Vignettes	3.8
Research Articles	4.3
Teacher as Classroom Leader Video tape	4.1
Computer Simulation	2.8
Peer Teaching	4.5
Micro Teaching	4.8

The low rating (2.8) of the computer simulation was quite disappointing, but changes in the format have been completed. It is also difficult for students to identify how helpful certain activities have been to them. When asked while they are teaching, where they learned a certain behavior, it was often difficult for them to identify when and where it was learned.

During the Spring 1988, students once again rated the learning experiences, however. The results can be found in Table 4.

Table 4

Means of Student Evaluations of Learning Experiences, Spring, 1988

N = 21

Learning Experience	Mean
Ethnography Video Tape	4.083
Vignettes	3.250
Research Articles	3.250
Teacher As A Classroom Leader Video Tape	3.583
Computer Simulation	2.833
Peer Teaching	3.166
Micro Teaching	3.333

The ratings are much lower than the previous fall with the ethnography videotape being rated the highest. The computer simulation remains with the lowest rating.

Practicum Notebooks or Journals

Practicum notebooks or journals are maintained by the students during their field experiences. The "sciences" practicum journal makes extensive use of the project instruments as well as other data included: Initial Observation Form; Second and Third Observation Form; Teaching Analysis Form; Establishing Teacher Presence in the Classroom; Self evaluation; Ethnographies; and relating the practicum to methods courses. These notebooks or journal entries were carefully analyzed for the Fall 1987 "sciences" practicum group (21). The data from this analysis are presented below.

1. Establishing Teacher Presence in the Classroom

After the preservice teachers had made their three initial visits to the schools for purposes of observation, each was asked to prepare a written response to five questions under the heading of "Establishing Yourself in the Classroom." (Appendix A) In responding to how they would establish a teacher presence, almost all preservice teachers indicated that they would begin by setting up or reviewing rules for students to follow during their teaching. Many discussed plans to follow through with enforcement of these rules as well.

Several preservice teachers felt that their presence had been established to some degree during the three observation periods, although some felt that the students perceived their presence more as a friend than a teacher, and said that they would achieve to strike a balance in gaining students' respect.

In responding to what procedures they would put into place, and how existing rules and procedures would be incorporated into their teaching, the preservice teachers generally indicated that they would use some or all of the existing rules and procedures in their own teaching. A few preservice teachers pointed out ways in which they would modify existing procedures to fit their own styles, and several planned to add new rules and procedures. In two cases, preservice teachers had observed ineffective management by their cooperating teachers which they planned to avoid emulating in their own teaching.

The intent of giving preservice teachers a means of communicating their plans for establishing presence prior to going into the classroom was served well. The desired outcome was achieved, as was seen in analysis of their detailed plans and reflections.

2. Predicted Concerns, Strengths, and Weaknesses

After an initial observation of the classrooms in which they would be doing practicum teaching, the preservice teachers responded in writing to questions regarding specific observations made. The last question asked them to "reflect on your own personal thoughts about teaching. What concerns do you have about teaching? What do you feel will be your strengths in the teaching role? Do you feel you will have any weaknesses or difficulties that might pose a problem?" This question was written with the intent of enabling the preservice teachers to reflect upon and solidify perceptions of their own concerns, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as creating a basis for comparison after their practicum teaching experiences.

Most of the preservice teachers expressed concerns about control of the class and their ability to handle classroom management. Other concerns were completely individualized, and ranged from reconciling the use of teaching methods which differed from those used by the cooperating teacher, to concerns about motivating students to learn.

It was interesting to note that few preservice teachers were able to predict instructional strengths. Strengths that were predicted were generally attitudinal, and were expressed as enthusiasm, desire for teaching, and working with children. Again, individualities of the preservice teachers were reflected in other predicted strengths, which were both instructional and attitudinal in nature.

Very few preservice teachers expressed specific weaknesses. Two predicted difficulty in maintaining a teacher presence, and two others pointed to classroom management and discipline as a weakness. The response to predicted weaknesses or difficulties was much lower than that for concerns and strengths. All

responses provided the basis for comparing predictions with perceptions of strengths and weaknesses after the practicum teaching had taken place.

3. Comparison of Teaching Styles

After preservice teachers had made all 3 classroom observations prior to teaching, they were asked to respond to various questions about teaching strategies used by the cooperating teachers. After responding to these in writing, preservice teachers were asked to consider their own teaching styles, and whether they would use the same teaching strategies as the cooperating teachers had if they were to teach the lessons themselves. The intent was to enable preservice teachers to mentally define their own teaching styles and strategies in relation to the specific lessons taught, and integrate, adapt, or reject observed strategies used by cooperating teachers.

In looking at responses to the question, certain patterns were found. Nine of the eleven preservice teachers pointed out specific strategies used by the cooperating teacher that they would use, while five pointed out specific strategies used that they did not find acceptable to adapt. Four preservice teachers pointed out specific ways they would modify the cooperating teacher's strategies, acceptable and unacceptable, to fit their own teaching styles, and three pointed out additional strategies they would have used in teaching the lesson. Six preservice teachers were fairly detailed in responding, while five had comments that were of a more generalized nature and that were fewer in number. The desired outcome of having the preservice teachers use analysis of cooperating teachers' strategies as a basis for adapting their own styles and strategies in teaching the same lessons was achieved.

4. Teaching Analysis

A Teaching Analysis Form (Appendix B) was filled out by each preservice teacher after teaching each of six lessons in the practicum classroom. These were used as a means for reflection about the lesson, and were of benefit to the preservice teachers both individually and in conference with their supervisors. Because of

miscommunications in intent of purpose, some of the preservice teachers made use of the teaching analysis form only when a lesson had been observed by the supervisor.

In looking at the responses on the teaching analysis forms, we considered primarily the development of analysis was considered. We wondered if the focus of analysis would shift from management and discipline in the first lessons to learning of students in the last lessons. We also wondered if the preservice teachers' analyses would progress from a degree of generality to a higher degree of specificity.

When we looked at the data, we found that no patterns emerged as anticipated. Preservice teachers' analysis of their teaching was individualistic in focus, progression, and degree of specificity. Some preservice teachers used the forms more seriously and made very specific comments while others' responses were sketchy. For example, one preservice teacher began after teaching the first lesson with a focus on students' learning in very specific terms as well as focusing more generally on discipline. This preservice teacher followed a pattern of detailed analysis after each lesson, and was concerned throughout with students' learning and ways the lesson could have been improved in addition to the development of successful management techniques. Another preservice teacher developed and maintained a pattern of very sketchy, general comments about both students' learning and management of the classroom.

The focus of analysis included management; discipline, students' learning; pacing the lesson; modifying the lesson for improvement; nervousness in teaching; students abilities; use of a particular model; adjusting the lesson to meet students' needs; teacher presence; management of small groups; questioning students; including all students; and teacher-student interactions. While the inclusion of these in analysis of teaching was a desired outcome, the preservice teachers made use of the teaching analysis form in varying degrees.

5. Self Evaluation

After their practicum teaching was completed, preservice teachers were asked to write self-evaluations, pointing out specific strengths and weaknesses they experienced in the teaching role. Although predicted strengths had largely been attitudinal ones, the preservice teachers identified strengths after their teaching that fell into three main areas. Of nine preservice teachers responding, five noted improvement in the development of effective management skills; five felt more confident in the teaching role, and five pointed to the planning of effective lessons as a strength. Almost one-half of the preservice teachers said that they had developed good rapport with the students. Other areas of strength indicated by individuals included guiding questioning; working with children individually or in small groups; evaluating lessons and adapting follow-up lessons; awareness of the whole class, and flexibility in teaching.

Weaknesses anticipated by the preservice teachers prior to their teaching experience had been few. It was interesting to note that ten different areas of weakness were reported by individuals after the practicum teaching. These included difficulty with lesson closure, consistent use of a specific rule and improvement of questioning techniques, among other weaknesses. It is our opinion that the ability of the preservice teachers to specify weaknesses or areas of difficulty so much more readily after the practicum teaching was a function of the teaching experience itself. Thus it was difficult for them to predict specific areas of weakness before experiencing the teaching role.

The most agreed upon weakness was that of the need for more experience with the development of effective classroom management skills. Two-thirds of the preservice teachers responding pointed to this as an area needing improvement. Interestingly, one-half of these also listed effective management as a strength; the general feeling of these preservice teachers was that they felt successful in their progress with classroom management so far, but were aware that the development of

effective management skills would be ongoing and challenging for them.

6. Ethnographies

During classroom training sessions preservice teachers were instructed in how to conduct ethnographic studies of their own teaching. The training materials included "On Observing Well: Self-Instruction in Ethnographic Observation for Teachers, Principals and Supervisors," which gives specific steps used in doing a classroom ethnography.

Next they viewed a staged tape in which an elementary classroom teacher displays several poor teaching techniques (i.e. talking to students with her back to them, calling on only a few students to respond to her questions). During discussions the preservice teachers were asked to identify specific questions the teacher could ask about her teaching in order to make improvements. It was emphasized that these questions need to be very specific and concern behaviors that can be observed and rated in some fashion.

When preservice teachers were in the field classroom, they were asked to formulate specific questions about their own classroom behaviors, then to audio or video tape one or more of their lessons and analyze the data according to the type of question asked. All of the ten preservice teachers who conducted mini-ethnographic studies used audio tape for data collection. Some taped one lesson; others taped more than one lesson for comparative purposes.

As can be seen in Appendix B, preservice teachers identified several common problem behaviors for study. Many looked at teacher-talk or responses to students, such as non-instructional talk or repeating students' responses. Another common problem centered around the questioning of students equally and the relationship between questioning of students and their location in the classroom. Other problems were represented by individuals.

Although the sophistication of data analysis varied somewhat, all preservice

teachers seemed to benefit from the miniethnographic studies. Several mentioned how unaware they had been of behaviors documented in their taping, or the frequency of those behaviors. Not only did listening to and analyzing the tapes serve to increase preservice teachers' awareness of their own behaviors, it also afforded them an opportunity to hear student-talk in a more discriminating fashion. The most desired outcome of participation in the mini-ethnographic studies was for preservice teachers to find them an invaluable tool for self-evaluation as they continue in their practica, student-teaching, and teaching experiences. In making suggestions on how to improve targeted problem areas after analysis of their ethnographic data, several preservice teaches wrote that they planned to do more ethnographies in the future.

7. Relating the practicum to the methods courses

The preservice teachers were asked to give a written response in defining for themselves the relationship between the methods courses (math, science and social studies) and the practicum experiences. In general, the relationship was felt to be both strong and positive. All the preservice teachers responding indicated that the teaching methods, strategies and ideas learned in the methods courses were very helpful in the practicum experience. In the words of one preservice teacher, "the science block methods courses were extremely helpful to the practicum. The knowledge we learned from them was practical knowledge, and it was good to be able to use that knowledge so soon." Another wrote, "I was gratified to find the methods I took from class actually worked."

The importance of this strong relationship for the preservice teachers was seen not only in positive comments, but in negative ones as well. Several preservice teachers felt that the math methods course focused more heavily on content than on methods of teaching, and expressed a feeling of frustration when preparing math lessons for the practicum teaching. In the absence of a strong working relationship between a methods course and the practicum experience, as was the case in a few

instances, preservice teachers sought other ways of learning methods of teaching that they needed for immediate application in the classroom.

The methods learned in the science and social studies courses were found to be very helpful for all of the preservice teachers, and most were able to use some of them in practicum teaching. Many preservice teachers said that they felt comfortable with a particular method after using it in the practicum classroom, or that they could better see the flexibility of a method and adapt it for use around any topic or concept.

Practice in writing lesson plans in all areas was also mentioned as being very helpful. One preservice teacher found the frequency of lesson plans required in the social studies course to be valuable; another would have liked even more practice in writing lesson plans for another of the methods courses.

Finally, some preservice teachers described the methods courses as "a means of gaining confidence and competence in teaching math, science and social studies that I will be able to use in my own teaching." Another commented "I felt confident when teaching math just because the methods course had given me a sense of confidence." Overall, the positive relationship felt by the preservice teachers was described well in the words of one preservice teacher, "I believe that one of the strongest aspects of the teacher education program at Peabody is to be found in the relationship between the methods courses and the practicum experiences."

Question 6: Field Support Team Interviews The members of the Field Support Team were interviewed to determine the degree to which they thought their participation in the program development was beneficial. The questions which made up the interview were designed to elicit responses which would reveal the participants' opinions of the most important aspects of the program. Questions included those which asked about the role of the Field Support Team in program development, the individual's role in that team, the activities in which the team engaged, and the format of the Field Support Team meetings. Those interviewed were

also given an opportunity to express their opinions about the program and give suggestions of activities that the Field Support Team could be involved in during the continued program development.

The general consensus of the teachers was that their role in the program development was to share the perspective of the practicing classroom teacher with those who are designing preservice teacher education programs. The teachers felt that student teachers need to be educated in programs that combine educational theory with the "real" world of the day-to-day elementary classroom. One teacher ventured that the participation of classroom teachers in designing preservice teacher education programs gave "validity to the proceedings."

Many of the teachers stressed that their participation on the Field Support Team helped them grow professionally. Involvement of the team's activities encouraged the teachers to analyze their classroom teaching and their work with preservice teachers. The seminars provided these master teachers with professional adult contact and exposure to some of the research findings that had been published since their last coursework was completed. The results of this kind of involvement included "more interest in day-to-day teaching" and the desire to "analyze the effects of various teacher behaviors" in classroom settings. The teachers also acknowledge receiving some needed positive feedback from the seminars. They found that many of their personal teaching methods were supported by research and by their peers.

Participation in the team gave the teachers a clearer view of the roles of practicum and student teaching in the teacher education process at Peabody/Vanderbilt. One teacher summarized this by stating, "It made me understand better what the student teacher had to accomplish. It was good to find specific things that a student teacher might need help with. I had never thought about helping with specific areas before."

The majority of the teachers did not think their actual work with practicum or student teachers had changed. However, several participants did mention that they felt they were now better equipped to guide the student teachers through their experience with the use of the "growth area objectives" presented to them. Two of the teachers asserted that they would now begin to give their undergraduate charges more control of the classroom sooner. On the whole, the Field Support Team finished their term with a better understanding of the role field experiences play in preservice teacher education, the specific needs of preservice teachers, and ways they can help their student teachers and practicum students become better teachers.

VII. Discussion of Results

The results from the observation of the students during their sciences practicum was most encouraging. The Fall 1986 practicum group was most competent by the semester they were to complete student teaching. When analyzing the results of the experimental and control groups during Spring 1987, it is obvious that the classroom lab experiences had an impact on the preservice teachers behaviors in the classroom. Some would question why the scores for some items were higher in Observation 1 than Observation 3, but it must be recognized that the expectations for the preservice teachers in their first lesson teaching the whole class would be lower than after they had been in the classroom for several weeks. It also is encouraging to see the improvement of the control group on items such as "makes pupils aware of rules' with a mean of 2.00 before the classroom lab experiences and a mean of 3.38 after having completed the CLE since this was the focus of one of the videotapes. Another set of items "uses substantive, higher level questions focusing on objectives", 3.44 before CLE and 3.63 after it; "allows wait time for responses", 3.78 before and 4.33 after; and "listens to student responses for guidance in developing following questions", 3.00 before and 4.00 after. Questioning was the focus for the peer and micro teaching lessons.

Interviewing students to determine their perceptions of the impact of the classroom lab experiences provides a richness of responses that can not be achieved on a rating scale. To record the feelings that students have toward the different learning experiences provides valuable information that leads to possible revision of an activity. For example, the response to the video tape by one student "Watching some of those teachers in action helped me. When I get out in the classroom I'll know how to do it" is much more revealing that marking a 4 on the rating scale. Or the student response "I thought the classroom rules videotape was great. I had always wondered about what I was going to do on the first day of school." confirmed to the project staff that the decision to videotape the first day of school was a good one.

The low rating of the computer simulation is understandable to some extent. Each time we have used them with a different group, we have changed the format. The spring 1988 group had the opportunity to experience two formats and indicate which was the most effective.

Analyzing the data from student notebooks or journal gives the project staff an opportunity to be better understand how students are feeling and reacting while they are in the actual classroom experience. The results from reviewing the data give further support to the success of the project learning experiences.

The ratings of the pre service teachers on the Student Performance Rating Scale at the completion of the three semester sequence of the project are really the final test of the worth the project activities. It appears from the results that the preservice teachers were well prepared for their student teaching experiences and the project was successful in reducing the problem areas.

The interviews with field support team only underlined the value of their input both to the project and themselves. It is obvious that students benefit by the FST's realistic discussions of the classroom; the content of the vignettes and filming of the videotapes. The field support team gives validity to the project activities.

VII. Implications for Improving Teacher Education

The feedback that we have received from presentations made at national meetings and from visitors to the project has been positive. At the AACTE meeting, the critic of the session cited our project as a prototype for the nation since we identified our problems, used the research and technology to seek solutions to them, and successfully implemented them. The process that we have initiated can be replicated by any teacher education institution to improve their program.

Products that result from the project will be valuable resources for other institutions particularly the computer simulations, videotapes and videodisc. There are institutions waiting for our products to be available for distribution.

The success of our collaboration with a field support team of practicing classroom teachers to aid in the redesign of the teacher preparation program is a model that other institutions may desire to follow. That collaboration proved beneficial to the teachers as well as the project.

Appendix A

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher develops awareness of the class by:

- recognizing off-task behavior
- having an awareness of pupils in all sections of the room
- developing ways of addressing all pupils

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher is able to design and teach lessons which flow smoothly by:

- pacing the lessons
- integrating content and management
- progressing the lesson logically
- justifying the time spent on each aspect of the lesson
- introducing the lesson effectively
- providing appropriate closure
- making smooth transitions to the next activity
- giving the pupils transition signals
- dealing with interruptions in a manner that minimizes the loss of instructional time

Research Findings Indicate:

Monitoring of the classroom by the teacher includes three dimensions:

1.) Teachers watch groups, and what is happening in the entire room.

2.) Teachers watch conduct/behavior of students and particularly notice behavior that does not meet expectations. "Withit" teachers stop misbehavior early.

3.) Teachers monitor the pace, rhythm, and duration of classroom events. Smoothness and momentum characterize more effective lessons while hesitations and lags increase off-task behavior. (Doyle, 1986, p. 414)

". . .there is a tension between the goal of maximum content coverage by pacing the students through the curriculum as rapidly as possible and the needs to: a) move in small steps so that each new objective can be learned readily and without frustration; b) see that students practice the new learning until they achieve consolidated mastery marked by smooth and correct responses; and c) where necessary, see that the students learn to integrate the new learning with other concepts and skills and to apply it efficiently in problem-solving situations." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 361)

"The pace at which the class can move will depend on the students' abilities and developmental levels, the nature of the subject matter, the student-teacher ratio, and the teacher's managerial and instructional skills." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 361)

"Students achieve more in classes where they spend most of their time being taught or supervised by their teachers rather than working on their own (or not working at all)." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 361)

"Achievement is maximized when teachers not only actively present material, but

structure it by beginning with overviews . . . and reviewing main ideas at the end. Organizing concepts and analogies helps learners link the new to the already familiar. Summary reviews integrate and reinforce the learning of major points." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 362)

"We would encourage teachers to evaluate their own instructional practices according to certain general criteria for looking at task and evaluation structures. What opportunities do low achievers have for success in classrooms? If they do succeed, do their classmates have a chance to see and evaluate that success? Does every child know clearly what he has done that is successful and what needs to be improved? Are competitive marks and grades the only basis children have for knowing how well they are performing? Do classroom tasks and objectives provide multiple dimensions of competence? Is reading a prerequisite for successful participation on all "important" tasks? How often does the teacher use multimedia tasks and small groups? Do the better readers dominate the interaction of task groups?" (Rosenholtz & Cohen, 1983, p. 526)

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher develops the ability to state and use rules in the classroom by:

- knowing a variety of ways of developing rules
- monitoring the rules and the consistency with which they are enforced
- making pupils aware of rules
- using a variety of strategies to deal with disruptive pupil behavior

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher develops an awareness of the uses of punishment by:

- using it with a consistency when it is used
- emphasizing its appropriateness (not using academic tasks, not embarrassing pupils)
- knowing that it should not waste class time nor interrupt the lesson
- making decisions and providing follow-up
- acknowledging that personal emotions must be removed as much as possible from the situation

Research Findings Indicate:

"The teacher . . . is expected to elicit work from students. Students in all subjects and activities must engage in directed activities which are believed to produce learning. Their behavior, in short, should be purposeful, normatively controlled and steady. . ." (Lortie, 1975, p. 151)

". . .it seems to us that adequate management of the classroom environment also forms a necessary condition for cognitive learnings; and if the teacher cannot solve problems in this sphere, we can give the rest of teaching away." (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974, p. 135)

"Learning is also dependent on variation in the use of authority in the classroom. There appear to be some classrooms where control of behavior is so much

more important a goal than substantive learning." (Cohen, 1972, p. 449)

"Better organized teachers were able to see through the eyes of their students in planning the classroom and in introducing the students to new routines during the year. They appeared to predict what would confuse or distract their students and what would be of immediate concern to them." (Evertson and Emmer, 1982, p. 8)

"Better managers were more explicit about what was desirable behavior." (Evertson and Emmer, 1982, p. 9)

". . .rules need to be clearly stated and understood and the penalties clearly indicated for violating them." (Rich, 1984, p. 110)

"Analyzing classroom tasks. Better managers demonstrated the ability to analyze the tasks of the first few weeks of school in precise detail. Their presentations to the students about rules, procedures, and assignments were very clear, and they provided specific feedback to students when inappropriate behavior occurred." (Evertson and Emmer, 1982, p. 8)

"It is important for students to understand why the rule was established and why it is necessary to comply with it." (Rich, 1984, p. 110)

"Teaching the going-to-school skills. Better managers incorporated the teaching of rules and procedures as a very important part of instruction during the first few weeks. That is, they taught going-to-school skills by providing practice and moving through procedures, giving feedback, responding to signals, and pointing out to students when they are behaving appropriately." (Evertson and Emmer, 1982, p. 8)

"This critical management task is far more complex than simply stating several rules about conduct. Although such rules can be useful, establishing clear expectations requires more time and effort because desirable behaviors frequently vary according to the classroom activity. For example, activities such as seatwork, small-group work, and whole-class instruction require very different student behaviors. Seatwork requires that students be able to work independently, follow directions, get help when they are unable to work on their own, and know what to do if they complete their seatwork. Whole-class instruction requires students to sit and listen to the teacher or other students, answer questions when asked, wait their turn to respond, and, frequently, raise their hands when they wish to volunteer a response or ask a question. Thus, stating a few rules for behavior will not be sufficient to guide student behavior during such disparate activities.

Because students are not automatically aware of, nor do they practice the behavior appropriate for an activity, it is the teacher's responsibility to know what the necessary behaviors are and to communicate them to the students." (Evertson and Emmer, 1982, p. 11)

"Planning consequences enables the teacher to encourage appropriate behavior from the beginning of the year and to be in a position to act promptly to deal with inappropriate behavior when it occurs." (Evertson and Emmer, 1982, p. 20)

". . .if the classroom is not rule-governed, the teacher may be inconsistent in administering punishment by either imposing a particular punishment one day for a misbehavior and ignoring it the next or deviating in the penalty chosen for the same infraction." (Rich, 1984, p. 110)

"In the use of punishment, teachers want to avoid inculcating feelings of failure and inadequacy. One way these feelings may likely be avoided is by students understanding rules and participating in their formulation." (Rich, 1984, p. 111)

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher uses his/her personality effectively in the classroom by:

- assuming a "teacher presence" in the classroom
- showing enthusiasm for teaching and children
- using a variety of expressions and voice inflections
- making use of non-verbal expressions
- being sensitive
- dressing professionally

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher reacts to student responses after:

- listening actively
- talking with students, not at them
- talking with different grade levels with appropriate language
- considering academic as well as social problems

Research Findings Indicate:

"Effective management consists of those teacher behaviors that produce high levels of student involvement in classroom activities and minimize student behaviors that interfere with the teacher's or other students' work and efficient use of instructional time." (Evertson and Emmer, 1982, p. 6)

". . . teachers affect students through what they say, how they question, how they explain, and through the use of curriculum materials." (Cohen, 1972, p. 444)

"effective teachers appear to be those who are, shall we say, 'human' in the fullest sense of the word. They have a sense of humor, are fair, empathetic, more democratic than autocratic, and apparently are more able to relate easily and naturally to students either on a one-to-one or group basis. Their classrooms seem to reflect miniature enterprise operations in the sense that they are more open, spontaneous, and adaptable to change." (Hamachek, 1969, pp. 341-342)

". . . what we need first of all are flexible, 'total' teachers who are (as) capable of planning around people as they are around ideas." (Hamachek, 1969, p. 344)

"Student attitudes were linked most closely to measures of teacher warmth and student orientation: praise, use of student ideas, willingness to listen to students and respect their contributions, and socializing with students in addition to instructing them." (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 369)

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher develops an awareness of the ways homework and seatwork can be used effectively by:

- insisting on quality
- monitoring the appropriateness of the work in relation to what

has been taught and the independent instructional level of the pupil
- offering a variety in assignments
- regulating the amount of work
- giving complete directions
- evaluating and monitoring assignments

Research Findings Indicate:

"The amount of student learning is influenced not only by the amount of engaged time (time when student is paying attention), but also by the "match" between the task and the particular student." (Fisher, Marliave, & Filby, 1977, p. 52)

"To foster cognitive achievement, it is important for the teacher to knnow the cognitive skills and level of performance of individual students." (Fisher, et al., 1981, p. 10)

"In both reading and math, students tend to make fewer errors on daily tasks when teachers spend more time structuring the lesson and giving directions. It seems critical that students understand what they are supposed to do so that they can respond correctly." (Fisher, et al., 1981, p. 11)

". . . it is a good idea to monitor seatwork by going around the room giving help or feedback as frequently as possible. Descriptions of high- achieving classes suggest that good teachers do this not only to keep students on task, but also to find out as much as they can about how students are doing so they can plan further instruction." (Fisher, et al., 1981, p. 12)

"The (elementary) teacher must divise some workable system using different settings (groupwork, seatwork) for different students in different content areas at different times during the day, and keep the whole system adaptable to changes in student needs during the year." (Fisher, et al., 1981, p. 14)

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher will become aware of opportunities for his/her pupils to take responsibilities in:

- group work
- use of classroom and school facilities
- leadership roles
- individual accountability

Research Findings Indicate:

". . . cooperative reward structures are associated with greater performance than are competitive and independent reward structures when the group task is an independent one (i.e., could not be performed by a single individual), but are assoicated with less performance when the task does not require coordination of efforts." (Slavin, 1977, p. 635)

". . . cooperative teams have positive effects on achievement, especially when instruction is carefully structured, individuals are accountable for performance, and a well-defined group reward system is used." (Doyle, 1986, p. 405)

"For low level learning outcomes, such as knowledge, calculation, and application

of principles, cooperative learning techniques appear to be more effective than traditional techniques to the degree they use:

a.) A structured, focused, schedule of instruction;

b.) Individual accountability for performance among team members;

c.) A well-defined reward system, including rewards or recognition for successful groups.

For high level cognitive learning outcomes, such as identifying concepts, analysis of problems, judgment, and evaluation, less structured cooperative techniques that involve high student autonomy and participation in decision-making may be more effective than traditional individualistic techniques." (Slavin, 1980, p. 337)

"Reviews of research on cooperative learning present convincing evidence that cooperative learning in various game and team contexts can lead to higher achievement, improved cross-race and cross-sex interaction, as well as improved attitudes toward school." (Dickson, 1982, p. 146)

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher develops a workable knowledge of questioning technique that includes:

- using substantive, higher level questions focusing on objectives
- allowing wait time for responses
- listening to student responses for guidance in developing the following questions
- questioning naturally versus the reading of questions to students
- responding to answers that are wrong or not focused on the topic

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher becomes aware of the differences in behavior some teachers show between high and low achievers accordingly in regards to:

- teacher expectations
- wait time
- limiting higher level questions to high achievers
- giving praise versus giving criticism
- use of non-verbal behavior

Research Findings Indicate:

"Teachers ask questions that, more often than not, call for remembered information; they ask many questions and give students little time to answer." (Cuban, 1984, p. 672)

"Gains in achievement can be expected when more higher cognitive than lower cognitive questions are used during instruction." (Redfield & Rousseau, 1981, p. 244)

"Planning and developing a potential sequence of key questions and activities that ask students to focus their thinking in a specific direction establish a framework for the kinds of verbal behavior the teacher will perform in actually teaching the lesson." (Tinsley, 1973, p. 710)

"Clearly expressed and transmitted questions reduce the possibility of student confusion and frustration. If the question does not specify the conditions to which students are to respond, time is wasted attempting to determine what the teacher is expecting." (Wilen & Clegg, 1986, p. 154)

"Effective teachers encourage students to respond in some way to each question asked. This established the expectation that the teacher waants students to reflect and respond to questions. Probing can be used to get a minimum response and unanswered questions can be redirected to other students." [Brophy & Good, 1985; Weil & Murphy, 1982] (in Wilen & Clegg, 1986, p. 156)

"Effective teachers allow 3-5 seconds of wait time after asking a question before requesting a response, particularly when higher cognitive level questions are asked." [Berliner, 1984; Brophy & Good, 1985; Weil & Murphy, 1982] (in Wilen & Clegg, 1986, p. 156)

Given increased teacher wait-time for student responses several benefits were noted:

a.) The length of student responses increased

b.) The number of unsolicited but appropriate student responses increased

c.) Failures to respond decrease

d.) Teacher-centered show and tell decreases an student-student comparing increases

e.) The number of questions asked by children increased

f.) Slow student contributions increased

g.) Teacher expectations for performance of certain children seem to become more positive (in Rowe, 1974, pp. 89-91)

When the amount of wait-time given, on the average, was examined, it was found that the students the teachers considered to be achievers got nearly two seconds to begin an answer while those seen as low achievers got slightly less than one second (0.9 seconds). (in Rowe, 1974, p. 84)

"A clear teacher expectation pattern develops early in the history of each classroom. Differences in the wait-time and reward patterns administered to children ranked at the top as compared with those at the bottom suggest that teachers unconsciously acted in such a way as to confirm their expectations." (in Rowe, 1974, p. 84)

"The pupils ranked at the bottom actually received more overt verbal praise than did those ranked at the top, but it was difficult to know with certainty what was being rewarded. Top ranked pupils received relatively less evaluative comment from their teachers but the rewards were usually more pertinent to the responses made. Those at the bottom gathered more praise but its intent was far more ambiguous. It appeared that teachers rewarded top groups for correct responses but they rewarded the bottom groups for both correct and incorrect responses." (in Rowe, 1974, p. 84)

OBJECTIVE: The preservice student teacher uses self-evaluation techniques to:

- assess personal strengths and weaknesses
- make lesson revisions and "think on his/her feet"
- reflect on and show a perceptiveness of teacher performance

Research Findings Indicate:

"Reflection is nothing other than internal deliberation, that is to say, a discussion which is conducted with oneself, just as it might be conducted with real interlocutors or opponents. One could say then that reflection is internalized social discussion." (Piaget, 1967, p. 40)

". . .to change teachers need the opportunity to evaluate not only their visible behavior but also their intellectual routines. . ." (McKibbin, 1978-1979, p. 80)

"We assume that teachers can learn from reflecting upon experience, and it seems possible that this type of learning could be related to teaching effectiveness. That is, teachers who reflect more on their teaching may learn more about teaching; by incorporating these deliberations into their planning activities, they may therefore improve their teaching more rapidly." (Morine, 1976, p. 4)

"What really are the relationships between a teacher's thoughts/actions and pupils learning? I believe we can all identify with the teacher in the classroom as he questions his own thoughts, instructional decisions and actions almost immediately. How many times have you mentally congratulated or second guessed yourself--I made the right move or where was the congruency between thought and action, translated to say, I could kick myself for doing that." (Marks, 1978-1979, p. 5)

Research Findings Indicate:

"Reflection is nothing other than internal deliberation, that is to say, a discussion which is conducted with oneself, just as it might be conducted with real interlocutors or opponents. One could say then that reflection is internalized social discussion." (Piaget, 1967, p. 40)

". . .to change teachers need the opportunity to evaluate not only their visible behavior but also their intellectual routines. . ." (McKibbin, 1978-1979, p. 80)

"We assume that teachers can learn from reflecting upon experience, and it seems possible that this type of learning could be related to teaching effectiveness. That is, teachers who reflect more on their teaching may learn more about teaching; by incorporating these deliberations into their planning activities, they may therefore improve their teaching more rapidly." (Morine, 1976, p. 4)

"What really are the relationships between a teacher's thoughts/actions and pupils learning? I believe we can all identify with the teacher in the classroom as he questions his own thoughts, instructional decisions and actions almost immediately. How many times have you mentally congratulated or second guessed yourself--I made the right move or where was the congruency between thought and action, translated to say, I could kick myself for doing that." (Marks, 1978-1979, p. 5)

PRACTICUM OBSERVATION FORM

Name _____

School _____

Subject _____ Grade _____

Type of Instruction _____

Rating Scale (Low High)	Objectives
	A. Awareness of the Class
1 2 3 4 5	1. Recognizes off-task behavior
1 2 3 4 5	2. Awareness of pupils in all sections of classroom
1 2 3 4 5	3. Develops ways of addressing all pupils
	B. Ability to use rules in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	4. Makes pupils aware of the rules
1 2 3 4 5	5. Monitors the rules and uses consistent enforcement of them
1 2 3 4 5	6. Uses a variety of strategies to deal with disruptive pupil behavior
	C. Effective use of personality in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	7. Assumes a "teacher presence" in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	8. Shows enthusiasm for teaching and children
1 2 3 4 5	9. Uses a variety of expressions and voice inflections
1 2 3 4 5	10. Makes use of non-verbal expressions
1 2 3 4 5	11. Sensitivity
___Yes ___No	12. Dresses professionally
	D. Reaction to Student Responses
1 2 3 4 5	13. Listens actively
1 2 3 4 5	14. Talks with students, not at them
1 2 3 4 5	15. Uses language appropriate for grade level

E. Knowledge of Questioning Technique

1 2 3 4 5 16. Uses substantive, higher level questions focusing on objectives

1 2 3 4 5 17. Allows wait time for responses

1 2 3 4 5 18. Listens to student responses for guidance in developing the following questions

F. Ability to design and teach lessons

1 2 3 4 5 19. Paces the lessons

1 2 3 4 5 20. Integrates content and management

1 2 3 4 5 21. Progresses the lesson logically

1 2 3 4 5 22. Justifies the time spent on each aspect of the lesson

1 2 3 4 5 23. Introduces the lesson effectively

1 2 3 4 5 24. Provides appropriate closure

1 2 3 4 5 25. Deals with interruptions in a manner that minimizes the loss of instructional time

Comments:

PRACTICUM EVALUATION

Spring 1988

Think carefully about the experiences in which you have participated to prepare you for your classroom practicum. Rate them according to how helpful you think they will be to you as you begin teaching.

		Very Helpful	Helpful	Neutral	Not Helpful	Really Not Helpfu
1.	Ethnography Video Tape Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
2.	Vignettees Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Research Articles Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Teacher As A Classroom Leader Video Tape Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
5.	Computer Simulation Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
6.	Peer Teaching Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Micro Teaching Comments:	5	4	3	2	1

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

GROUP 1

1. How did you feel when you went out into the classroom?

2. Did you have the communications block before taking this class?

3. If yes, do you think it helped you feel better about teaching in this practicum? How?

4. What specifically did you learn from the activities in this practicum that you later applied to your practicum teaching?

5. Have you learned things other places that were helpful? What?

6. What did you learn in practicum that was most easily transferred to your classroom lessons? Why?

7. When, if ever, did you begin to feel more confident about your teaching in this practicum?

GROUP 2

1. a. How did you feel when you first went out into the classroom to teach?

   b. Did you feel better when you went out the second time after having been back on campus in the practicum classroom?

2. - 7. (Same as for Group 1)

ESTABLISHING YOURSELF IN THE PRACTICUM CLASSROOM

Write your plans for the assigned practicum/student teaching experience. How will you establish your teaching presence in the classroom? What procedures will you put in place? How will these be communicated to the students? Since you have already observed, what rules and procedures are presently in place? How will these be incorporated into your teaching?

Appendix B

PRACTICUM OBSERVATION FORM

Name _____

School _____

Subject _____ Grade _____

Type of Instruction _____

Rating Scale Low High	Objectives
	A. Awareness of the Class
1 2 3 4 5	1. Recognizes off-task behavior
1 2 3 4 5	2. Awareness of pupils in all sections of classroom
1 2 3 4 5	3. Develops ways of addressing all pupils
	B. Ability to use rules in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	4. Makes pupils aware of the rules
1 2 3 4 5	5. Monitors the rules and uses consistent enforcement of them
1 2 3 4 5	6. Uses a variety of strategies to deal with disruptive pupil behavior
	C. Effective use of personality in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	7. Assumes a "teacher presence" in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	8. Shows enthusiasm for teaching and children
1 2 3 4 5	9. Uses a variety of expressions and voice inflections
1 2 3 4 5	10. Makes use of non-verbal expressions
1 2 3 4 5	11. Sensitivity
___Yes ___No	12. Dresses professionally
	D. Reaction to Student Responses
1 2 3 4 5	13. Listens actively
1 2 3 4 5	14. Talks with students, not at them
1 2 3 4 5	15. Uses language appropriate for grade level

E. Knowledge of Questioning Technique

1 2 3 4 5	16. Uses substantive, higher level questions focusing on objectives
1 2 3 4 5	17. Allows wait time for responses
1 2 3 4 5	18. Listens to student responses for guidance in developing the following questions

F. Ability to design and teach lessons

1 2 3 4 5	19. Paces the lessons
1 2 3 4 5	20. Integrates content and management
1 2 3 4 5	21. Progresses the lesson logically
1 2 3 4 5	22. Justifies the time spent on each aspect of the lesson
1 2 3 4 5	23. Introduces the lesson effectively
1 2 3 4 5	24. Provides appropriate closure
1 2 3 4 5	25. Deals with interruptions in a manner that minimizes the loss of instructional time

Comments:

STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION
COOPERATING TEACHER - FIRST PLACEMENT

Student _____ Semester _____

1st Placement: _____

Supervisor: _____

Final Evaluation Summary:

_____ Planning Skills _____ Evaluation Skills

_____ Instructional Skills _____ Management Skills

_____ Personal and Professional Skills

1 = Inadequate performance
2 = Performance needs improvement
3 = Improved performance
4 = Good performance
5 = Outstanding performance

Comments:

I have read the final evaluation and have had the opportunity to discuss it.

STUDENT TEACHER _____ DATE _____

May this evaluation be used as a recommendation by the College Placement Office?

YES _____ NO _____ Signature of Student _____

_____ _____
Signature, Cooperating Teacher Signature, University Supervisor

_____
Signature, University Coordinator

STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE:

1 = Inadequate performance
2 = Performance is weak
3 = Performance has improved and needs to continue to do so
4 = Good performance
5 = Outstanding performance

N/O = Not observed
S/E = Superior (Performance in this area is more like that of an exceptional inservice teacher)

Evaluations 1st	2nd	
		PLANNING SKILLS
____	____	1. Does appropriate written planning for daily lessons
____	____	2. Does appropriate written planning for an integrated unit
____	____	3. Effectively plans ahead of time
____	____	4. Plans for self-evaluation and written critique
		EVALUATION SKILLS
____	____	5. Records of individual student progress are maintained
____	____	6. Uses formal and informal evaluation techniques in teaching
____	____	7. Makes revisions in lessons based on evaluation results
		INSTRUCTIONAL AND MANAGEMENT SKILLS
____	____	8. Organizes space, materials and equipment
____	____	9. Uses instructional time effectively and efficiently
____	____	10. Involves learners throughout instruction
____	____	11. Makes modifications in instruction when needed
____	____	12. Uses questioning to reinforce and encourage learners
____	____	13. Provides oral feedback to learners about progress
		14. Uses appropriate methods of instruction matching the needs of:
____	____	a. small groups
____	____	b. large groups
____	____	c. individuals

1st	2nd		
____	____	15.	Conducts creative lessons using a variety of methods
____	____	16.	Encourages creative work by students
		17.	Communicates effectively by:
____	____		a. explaining assignments and directions clearly
____	____		b. writing legibly without errors in grammar
____	____		c. spelling correctly
____	____		d. using speech which is free of errors in grammar
____	____		e. using voice and speech to enhance instruction
		18.	Manages student interactions by:
____	____		a. establishing guidelines for acceptable behavior
____	____		b. implementing appropriate classroom discipline procedures
____	____		c. providing positive feedback to students about their behavior
____	____		d. addressing problems with a minimum of instructional interference

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

____	____	19.	Communicates personal enthusiasm for the learner, the class, and the subject
____	____	20.	Demonstrates respect for all cultures
____	____	21.	Demonstrates sensitivity, patience, and a sense of humor
____	____	22.	Helps learners develop positive self-concepts
____	____	23.	Attends to responsibilities in a prompt and dependable manner
____	____	24.	Exhibits cooperation throughout experience
____	____	25.	Maintains professional appearance
____	____	26.	Follows policies and procedures
____	____	27.	Accepts constructive criticism from supervisor and cooperating teacher

_____ _____ 28. Establishes personal teaching goals and plans for improvement

_____ _____ 29. Exemplifies a professional attitude

Bring completed form to conference
with supervisor.

TEACHING ANALYSIS FORM

When you have completed teaching a lesson in your practicum settings, consider the following questions:

1. How well did you accomplish your objectives?

2. Did you make any adjustments in your original teaching plan?

   If so, why?

3. If you taught the lesson again, what would you change?

4. What was the most important aspect you learned about yourself, and the students as a result of teaching the lesson?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

GROUP 1

1. How did you feel when you went out into the classroom?

2. Did you have the communications block before taking this class?

3. If yes, do you think it helped you feel better about teaching in this practicum? How?

4. What specifically did you learn from the activities in this practicum that you later applied to your practicum teaching?

5. Have you learned things other places that were helpful? What?

6. What did you learn in practicum that was most easily transferred to your classroom lessons? Why?

7. When, if ever, did you begin to feel more confident about your teaching in this practicum?

GROUP 2

1. a. How did you feel when you first went out into the classroom to teach?

   b. Did you feel better when you went out the second time after having been back on campus in the practicum classroom?

2. - 7. (Same as for Group 1)

CLASSROOM ANALYSIS FORM

Teacher As Classroom Leader

After viewing the videotape, consider the following questions. Think about the research findings that have been reviewed.

1. List some of the comments that the experienced teachers gave that will assist you as you begin to work in the classroom.

2. What approach was the teacher using to establish the rules at the beginning of the school year?

How does her approach relate to the research?

3. How did the students initially react to this approach of establishing the rules?

4. During the second day of school what did the teacher do to reinforce the rules? How effective was this?

5. What other ways could rules be established for a classroom?

6. Give examples of rules that might have resulted from these other ways.

7. Why should you review the rules before beginning an activity?

8. What did the teacher do to establish the climate for the circle meeting?

9. What were some of the ways the teacher used her personality traits effectively?

10. What are some of your personality traits that will help you establish yourself in the classroom?

11. How were management and instruction integrated in the taped scene?

Classroom Analysis Form

Consider the classroom vignette with Mrs. Watkins. React to the following questions:

1. What appears to be the initial problem?

2. What are the concerns of the teacher?

3. If you were the teacher how would you solve the problem? Which of the solutions would you choose?

4. Are you aware of any research findings that would help you solve the problem?

PRACTICUM EVALUATION
Fall 1987

Think carefully about the experiences in which you have participated to prepare you for your classroom practicum. Rate them according to how helpful you think they will be to you as you begin teaching.

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Neutral	Not Helpful	Really Not Helpful
1. Ethnography Video Tape Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
2. Vignettees Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
3. Research Articles Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
4. Teacher As A Classroom Leader Video Tape Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
5. Computer Simulation Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
6. Peer Teaching Comments:	5	4	3	2	1
7. Micro Teaching Comments:	5	4	3	2	1

ED. 2280 PRACTICUM "SCIENCES BLOCK"

Classroom Observation

Initial Visit

Name _____

Grade _____

School _____

1. Observe the physical aspects of the classroom (placement of student desks, teacher's desk, instructional materials, lighting, bulletin boards, colors, etc.). How do they add or detract from the learning experience?

2. Observe the organization of the class. Are they grouped? Do they work individually or as a whole class?

3. Observe the classroom management techniques of the teacher. Do students raise hands before speaking? Can they sharpen pencils at any time? What are arrangements for leaving the room? How does the teacher get their attention? Are there specific classroom rules? Do students waste time?

4. Request a copy of the science, math, and social studies textbooks. Determine what has been taught and the future goals. Discuss with teachers the possible lessons you might teach. What other instructional materials are available?

   Title of text?
   Publisher?
   Material Taught

5. Observe the atmosphere of the classroom. Explain what and how the teacher behaviors mold the classroom atmosphere. What type of atmosphere has been established?

6. Reflect on your own personal thoughts about teaching. What concerns do you have about teaching? What do you feel will be your strengths in the teaching role? Do you feel you will have any weaknesses or difficulties that might pose a problem?

ED. 2280 PRACTICUM "SCIENCES BLOCK"

Classroom Observation

Second and Third Visit

Name _____

Grade _____

School _____

1. What teaching strategy/ies is/are the teacher using? Describe.

2. What behaviors are being exhibited by the students?

3. How is/are the teaching strategy/ies motivational to the students?

4. How will the teaching strategy/ies accommodate the possible different learning styles in the classroom?

5. What evidence can you identify that the teacher has diagnosed the abilities/skills of the learners? What, if any, apparent diagnosis is occurring during the lesson?

6. Consider your own teaching style. If you were teaching the lesson, would you use the same teaching strategy/ies? Explain.

MEAN SCORES FOR FINAL EVALUATION OF PRACTICUM STUDENTS

PRACTICUM OBSERVATION FORM

Name _____

School _____

Subject _____ **Grade** _____

Type of Instruction _____

Rating Scale (Low … High)	Mean	Objectives
		A. Awareness of the Class
1 2 3 4 5	4.4	1. Recognizes off-task behavior
1 2 3 4 5	4.3	2. Awareness of pupils in all sections of classroom
1 2 3 4 5	4.7	3. Develops ways of addressing all pupils
		B. Ability to use rules in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	4.6	4. Makes pupils aware of the rules
1 2 3 4 5	4.5	5. Monitors the rules and uses consistent enforcement of them
1 2 3 4 5	4.4	6. Uses a variety of strategies to deal with disruptive pupil behavior
		C. Effective use of personality in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	4.8	7. Assumes a "teacher presence" in the classroom
1 2 3 4 5	4.5	8. Shows enthusiasm for teaching and children
1 2 3 4 5	4.5	9. Uses a variety of expressions and voice inflections
1 2 3 4 5	4.0	10. Makes use of non-verbal expressions
1 2 3 4 5	4.4	11. Sensitivity
___Yes ___No		12. Dresses professionally
		D. Reaction to Student Responses
1 2 3 4 5	4.7	13. Listens actively
1 2 3 4 5	4.6	14. Talks with students, not at them
1 2 3 4 5	4.8	15. Uses language appropriate for grade level

	E. <u>Knowledge of Questioning Technique</u>	
1 2 3 4 5 4.4	16. Uses substantive, higher level questions focusing on objectives	
1 2 3 4 5 4.6	17. Allows wait time for responses	
1 2 3 4 5 4.0	18. Listens to student responses for guidance in developing the following questions	
	F. <u>Ability to design and teach lessons</u>	
1 2 3 4 5 4.6	19. Paces the lessons	
1 2 3 4 5 4.6	20. Integrates content and management	
1 2 3 4 5 4.8	21. Progresses the lesson logically	
1 2 3 4 5	22. Justifies the time spent on each aspect of the lesson	
1 2 3 4 5 4.5	23. Introduces the lesson effectively	
1 2 3 4 5 4.7	24. Provides appropriate closure	
1 2 3 4 5 4.3	25. Deals with interruptions in a manner that minimizes the loss of instructional time	

Comments:

PROJECT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Field Support Team

1. What do you perceive the value to be of the Field Support Team?

   Importance of the team in general?

   Role of the team in this project?

2. What were the personal benefits for you and the seminars? (Give example.)

   In general professional growth or teaching?

3. How did you benefit from reading the research? (Give example.)

   Professional growth or teaching?

4. How did your participation on the team help you work with student teachers or practicum students?

   Did you work with her differently than you had worked with previous preservice teachers? (Give example.)

5. How would you change either the role or the format of the Field Support Team?

6. What might the staff of the project have done differently that would have made the experience more beneficial? (Give specific examples.)

7. If you were to be on the team next year, what would you want the activities to include? (Be specific, if possible.)

8. Is there anything that you have gained from this experience that you would want to give as advice to other cooperating teachers?

   Cooperating teachers of both practicum and student teachers?

Ethnographies - Fall 1987

1. Identify problem(s) students chose
2. Identify data collection procedure
3. Identify method of data analysis
4. Identify conclusions drawn

Campbell

1. amount of non-instructional teacher-talk
2. audio tape of 2 sessions
3. tallied categorized responses
4. - non-instructional teacher-talk decreased from 12.7% of instructional time in the first taped session to 2.06% in the second taped session
   - silence was substituted as an instructional strategy more frequently in session 2
   - still uses nonfluencies

Culver

1. teacher responses:
   - repeating student responses
   - praising student responses
2. audio tape
3. tallied of student and teacher responses
4. - repeats student responses often
   - praising of a student responses is more likely when the response isn't repeated
   - repeats more than praises responses
   - both repeating and praising responses occur with more frequencly near end of lesson

Guild

1. pacing the lesson
   repeating student responses
   guiding the children or being led by them
   excessive focus on individuals or small groups vs. whole class
2. audio tape
3. timed barious parts of TABA lesson
   tallies, checklist
4. - repeats responses too often
   - needs to balance areas of lesson for better pacing
   - needs to keep students more on track during the lesson
   - does focus on all students in questioning

Johnson

1. phrasing used in asking students to answer a question
2. audio tape
3. categorized phrasing of responses; tally
4. - usually called students' names when asking for response to questions
   - phrasing used was related to instructional strategy being used in lesson
   - students whose names were called most often were seated on first rows or had "obvious" personalities

Magne

1. questioning students in relation to their location in classroom
2. audio tape
3. categorized teacher talk and student talk
   seating chart; tally
4. - calls on one section of class more often (left side)
   - students' responses became more off-topic/task as lesson progressed
   - increases extensions and repeats responses more as lesson progresses.

MacCartney

1. teacher responses & use of silence fillers
2. audio tape
3. tallies of categorized responses
4. - the use of silence fillers and simple responses decreased as the lesson proceeded
   - the use of complex responses increased as the lesson progressed

McAtee

1. use of non-instructional dialogue:
   - class management phrases
   - extraneous words
   - repeating students' answers
   - questioning students equally
2. audio tape
3. tally; categorized teacher phrases
   comparative analysis of first and last lessons
4. analysis of first lesson:
   - spent too much class time using class management phrases (25 times in 30 minutes)
   - overused both "ok" and "now"
   - repeated students' responses more than realized
   - did call on favored students more than others

   analysis of last lesson:
   - number of class management phrases decreased
   - continued to use "ok" but with decreased frequency; added use of "allright"
   - continued to repeat student responses, though with decreased frequency
   - decreased number of times favored students were questioned, but did question one student more than anyone else

Nygaard

1. questioning students equally
   classroom location of students called on more frequently
2. audio tape
3. tallied questions asked of each student
4. - does call on several students more often
   - called on all students except one
   - no particular area of class had students who were questioned more frequently
   - those called on most frequently always raised hands when questions were asked

Shamas

1. questioning students equally
   repeating students' responses
   judging students' responses
2. audio tape
3. tally
4. - questioned several students more frequently than others
   - repeated 21 of 27 responses verbatim; paraphrased/clarified 2 more
   - corrected 3 responses and said "ok", "good", or "correct" to 14 responses

Sullivan

1. method used to get students quiet
2. audio tape
3. tallies of different techniques used and success of each
4. -turning out the lights was most successful for quick student response
   - silence was also successful
   - by end of lesson, quietly saying "be quiet" also brought quick student response

PRACTICE PROFILE

Peabody Preservice Teachers As Problem Solvers

Peabody College of Vanderbilt

September 1988

Funded by a grant from the Office of
Educational Research and Improvement

Dorothy J. Skeel, Project Director

PRACTICE PROFILE

Peabody PreService Teachers As Problem Solvers

I. Assistance in Program Development

Component A: Advisory Group

Ideal	Acceptable	Unacceptable
COMPOSITION	**COMPOSITION**	**COMPOSITION**
College Education Faculty (Researcher and methods instruction) Cognitive psychologist Technical consultant Classroom teacher Public school administrator College administrator	All of the ideal except cognitive psychologist and combining the researcher and methods person	Any single group not represented from acceptable
TASKS	**TASKS**	**TASKS**
Identify salient research Review and evaluate project products Provide a link between research and practice	Limited input	Would not provide guidance
MEETINGS	**MEETINGS**	**MEETINGS**
At least twice a year	Twice a year	Once a year

Component B: Field Support Team

Ideal	Acceptable	Unacceptable
COMPOSITION Four classroom teachers	**COMPOSITION** Three classroom teachers	**COMPOSITION** One or two classroom teachers
TASKS Confirm problem areas of students in practica and student teaching Participate in research seminars in order t become familiar with the research and assist in selecting that which appropriate for students Design classroom situations for vignettes and computer simulations. Be video taped in classroom to provide realistic classroom situations for pre-service students. Assist in creating menu on making selection about videodisc Assist in the evaluation of project activities.	**TASKS** Teachers provide guidance only based on experience as classroom teachers. All of the ideal.	**TASKS** Teachers present irrelevant concerns and information during meetings.
MEETINGS Five or six times a year	**MEETINGS** Three or four	**MEETINGS** One or two

Component C: Project Staff

Ideal

COMPOSITION/ DESCRIPTIONS

Project Director - should be teacher educator and methods instructor
Associate Director - teacher educator involved with extensive practicum and student teachers
Technical Consultants- computer programmer and media consultant who can interface computer with video tape and video disc
Video Assistant (Graduate Assistant)-film videotapes in classrooms and edit
Research and Evaluation Assistant (Graduate)

TASKS

Project Director coordinates the activities of the project.
Associate Director serves to bridge the field experiences of practica and student teaching to project.
Project staff meets regularly with Advisory Group Field Support Team.
Project Staff designs learning components for pre-service teachers utilizing the advice of the Advisory Group and Field Support Team

MEETINGS

Weekly for first year

Acceptable

COMPOSITION/ DESCRIPTIONS

Project Director assumes Associate Director role as well
Technical Consultant also videotapes and edits
Research and evaluation Assistant

TASKS

Same as ideal

MEETINGS

Weekly first semester and bi-weekly thereafter

Unacceptable

COMPOSITION/ DESCRIPTIONS

Project Director Technical assistance from outside resources

TASKS

Project Director does not coordinate activities of the project.
Associate Director is not involved in field experiences.
Project staff does not work effectively with Advisory Group and Field Support Team.
Project Staff designs learning components for pre-service students without utilizing the advice of the Advisory Group and Field Support Team.

MEETINGS

Monthly

Component D: Faculty Consultants

Ideal	Acceptable	Unacceptable
COMPOSITION	**COMPOSITION**	**COMPOSITION**
Faculty Consultants - methods instructors, practicum and student teaching coordinators, and instructional technology	Methods professors	No consultants
TASKS	**TASKS**	**TASKS**
Faculty consultants advise Project Staff on the development of the learning components. Integrate project activities into their instruction	Integrate project activities into their instruction	Faculty consultants do not advise Project Staff on the development of the learning components nor integrate activities into their instruction.
MEETINGS Once a month with Project Staff	**MEETINGS** Meet each semester	**MEETINGS** Do not meet

Component E: Field Supervisor

Ideal	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Field Supervisors - graduate assistants - supervise all preservice students in field experiences	Field Supervisors - graduate assistants - supervise all preservice teachers in field experiences	No graduate assistants
Participate in all activities of the project	Participate in an orientation of project activities	
Review the research	Review the research	

Implementation Requirements

II. PREPARATION OF PARTICIPANTS (Project Staff)

Ideal	Acceptable	Unacceptable
COMPOSITION	**COMPOSITION**	**COMPOSITION**
Project staff, field support team and supervisors	Same as ideal	Only project staff
ORIENTATION	**ORIENTATION**	**ORIENTATION**
Read and review research on the uses of technology, problem-solving, cooperative learning, teacher education, teacher effectiveness and classroom management.	Same as ideal	Fail to do any of orientation activities
Assess technical resources and facilities that are available for program participants		
Program orientation in juxtaposition with overall departmental goals		

III. INSTRUCTIONAL PRESENTATION- Give preservice teachers exposure to practice in solving classroom problems

Ideal	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Component A: **VIGNETTES** Preservice teachers read written descriptions of classroom situations with alternative solutions for solving the problems. Preservice teachers role play or discuss their choice of alternative and support choice with research	**VIGNETTES** Preservice teachers read vignettes and write choice of alternative solution without discussion or role play	**VIGNETTES** Preservice teachers read vignettes
Component B: **VIDEOTAPES** Preservice teachers view tapes of classroom scenes pertinent to identified problem areas. Videotapes provide the basis from which preservice teachers begin developing discrimination skills in identifying problem areas within the complexity of the classroom. Advanced organizers are used at the discretion of the practicum professor. Preservice teachers discuss the tapes, integrating their observations of practice with relevant research.	**VIDEOTAPES** Preservice teachers view video tapes and write observations of problem areas, specifying teacher and student behaviors and interactions.	**VIDEOTAPES** Preservice teachers view the videotapes

Component c:

COMPUTER SIMULATIONS	COMPUTER SIMULATIONS	COMPUTER SIMULATIONS
Preservice teachers work at the computers individually or in pairs. Classroom situations are presented, and preservice teachers identify problems from a list provided. Alternative solutions and citations from relevant research are presented. Preservice teachers determine whether or not the research supports solutions given. Consequences for each alternative solution are viewed. Preservice teachers evaluate all the data in choosing a preferred solution, and defend their choices in a classroom discussion following the simulation.	Preservice teachers work through the computer simulation individually or in pairs but are not required to defend their choice of solution in class discussion.	Preservice teachers read through the computer simulation without using the data to identify problems or read an acceptable solution.

Component D:

VIDEODISC	VIDEODISC	VIDEODISC
Preservice teachers have opportunities for individualized problem solving. The videodisc contains short clips of classroom scenes of various types of small-group instruction; still frames of research citations, and expert commentary. Preservice teachers either make use of multiple menus created for a variety of issues in small group instruction, or create their own menus from the clips provided.	Preservice teachers problem solve through instructors selection of menu of classroom scenes	Preservice teachers view classroom scenes on videodisc.

IV. Reflective and Self Evaluation Experiences

Component A:

ETHNOGRAPHIES	ETHNOGRAPHIES	ETHNOGRAPHIES
Ethnographic research techniques are presented to the preservice teachers*. A videotape is viewed in which poor teaching techniques are staged in a elementary classroom situation. Preservice teachers identify specific questions the teacher could ask about her teaching that would lead to improvement. Preservice teachers apply the skill of asking specific questions about their behaviors in their own field experiences by conducting mini-ethnographies of their own teaching. A problem behavior is identified with specific question; data is collected and analyzed; conclusions are drawn and suggestions are made for improvement	Same as ideal.	The practicum classroom experiences are the same but with no application in the preservice teacher's field experience.

*(Materials include "On Observing Well: Self Instruction in Ethnographic Observation for Teachers, Principals and Supervisors"

Component B:

PEER TEACHING	**PEER TEACHING**	**PEER TEACHING**
Preservice teachers use a lesson plan written in methods courses in simulating a classroom situation with their peers acting as the students. A critique and discussion follows the teaching of the lesson.	Same as ideal.	Preservice teachers peer teach a lesson with no discussion and feedback following the lesson.

Component C:

MICRO-TEACHING	**MICRO-TEACHING**	**MICRO-TEACHING**
Preservice teachers teach lessons to their peers in the laboratory practicum classroom while being videotaped. Lessons may be those used in peer teaching, or new ones written in conjunction with methods courses. Taped lessons are viewed by the class for critique and discussion	Same as ideal	No critique and discussion follows playback of videotaped lessons.

V. Student Teaching

Component A:

Structured Interviews	**Structured Interviews**	**Structured Interviews**
During the first week of each of the two placements, student teachers observe their respective cooperating teachers for a one-hour block of time focusing on classroom management and organization, the student teacher meets with a peer who interviews him/her about the management style and techniques that were observed.	Observations and interviews are only completed during one placement	No observations are formalized.

Component B:

STUDENT TEACHING SEMINARS	**STUDENT TEACHING SEMINARS**	**STUDENT TEACHING SEMINARS**
Ten seminars are held for student teachers to analyze observation data they collect in the classroom. These seminars are designed to "bridge the gap" between university coursework/expectations and the public school classroom. They also help student teachers connect research to practice and establish a model for problem solving during future teaching	Five to nine seminars are held after a full day in the school	No seminars for student teachers are provided.